UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA STATESVILLE DIVISION

UNITED ST	ATES OF AMERICA,)	DOCKET	NO.	5:15-cr-15-1
	VS.)	VOLUME	IV	of IV
STEVEN W.	CHASE,)			
	Defendant.)			
		_)			

TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD L. VOORHEES
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
SEPTEMBER 16, 2016

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Government:

REGINALD E. JONES, ESQ., United States Department of Justice 1400 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20005

CORTNEY S. RANDALL, ESQ., BENJAMIN BAIN-CREED, ESQ., Assistant United States Attorney 227 West Trade Street, Suite 1700 Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

On Behalf of the Defendant:

PETER ADOLF, ESQ., Federal Defenders of Western North Carolina 129 West Trade Street, Suite 300 Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

> LAURA ANDERSEN, RMR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Charlotte, North Carolina

		450
1	<u>INDEX</u>	
2	Charge conference451 Defendant motion462	
3	Court's opening instructions	
4	Defendant closing	
5	Court's substantial instructions531 Jury question574	
6	Jury question	
7	Court's forfeiture instructions579 Government closing on forfeiture584	
8	Defendant closing on forfeiture586 Government closing on forfeiture587	
9	Jury verdict588	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
2122		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2016:

THE COURT: Okay. There was one question about the double jeopardy issue. The defendant submitted certain case law about it. The question that comes about would be whether there would be a double jeopardy problem if the jury should find defendant guilty of all counts but not Three; Three being the Advertising substantive count.

MR. JONES: Your Honor, may we -- the Government briefly address these cases?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. JONES: Your Honor, we read the defense's cases last night, Your Honor. It's the Government's position that the issue with the case now is whether there has been sufficient evidence presented in this trial for a jury to convict the defendant on Counts One and Two.

My office has prosecuted several of these cases over the last three years where the defendant has been charged with, as to Count One The Enterprise, and as to Count Two Conspiracy To Advertise Child Pornography as has been charged in this case, Your Honor. U.S. versus Defoggi is one out of the District of Nebraska; U.S. V Wise, Western District of Louisiana; U.S. v Mosher, Central District of Illinois, and also the Grovo case, which your clerk cited in the jury instructions, Your Honor, which is a Ninth Circuit case -- a

published opinion that was published a couple of months ago, Your Honor. All of these cases charged both the enterprise and the conspiracy to advertise. And the jury was charged on both these counts, Your Honor. The United States admits that --

THE COURT: I'm not saying we wouldn't charge on it.

I'm saying the question would be whether it would be a double
jeopardy issue --

MR. JONES: It --

THE COURT: -- depending on what the jury did. And we could handle that just by instructions on the verdict sheet, you know, if you find this and that and don't -- don't do Count Two, something like that.

MR. JONES: What has happened in these four -- five cases I just mentioned, Your Honor, is that double jeopardy doesn't attach until judgment, a punishment has been entered, Your Honor. So it's our position that prior to sentencing, as has been done in previous cases, the United States either moves for Count Two -- if the defendant is convicted of Counts One and Two -- we will move for Count Two to be dismissed. Or the Court on its own extent at that point could just vacate Count Two, Your Honor. But that doesn't become an issue until the sentencing phase of the trial, Your Honor, not during this phase, Your Honor.

Even in the -- you know, even if he's -- that's if

he's found guilty on both counts, Your Honor. So that's something that should be taken up prior to judgment at the sentencing.

Even the two cases, the Hawthorne case, the Eighth Circuit case the defendant brought up to support his motion, Your Honor, that was -- double jeopardy didn't attach until the conviction -- he was convicted and sentenced, you know, based on some of the same conduct. So that's when the double jeopardy attaches, you know, after the sentence or the judgment.

We submit that after the trial, if the defendant is convicted on both counts, and prior to sentencing, you know, the United States will either move to dismiss the lesser included offense or the Court in its discretion can vacate Count Two at that time.

THE COURT: All right. Anything from the defendant?

MR. ADOLF: Judge, I think the confusion may arise

from the fact that a lot of these cases, or most of these

cases are dealing with the issue after it's already happened

on 2255 and so forth. And then the question becomes if it's a

sufficient remedy or not to just dismiss one of the counts.

That's what most of the case law seems to be about because

that's when it comes up. Otherwise, if the jury's instructed

correctly then it doesn't come up because it's not an issue.

And I question the wisdom that the Government

suggests of doing something that case law says is error on the theory that it ultimately can be made harmless later on.

THE COURT: Well, I'm going to adopt your position

MR. ADOLF: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me see if I can pose something in a similar context, perhaps the same question.

on that and we can handle it by how we word the verdict sheet.

If there's a not guilty on Count Three, is there any double jeopardy?

MR. ADOLF: I'm sorry, is Your Honor addressing Count Three or Count Two? Because Count Two is the Advertising Conspiracy.

THE COURT: Two is the Conspiracy --

MR. ADOLF: Right.

THE COURT: -- to Advertise. Three is the substantive -- I mean, Advertising count.

MS. RANDALL: That's a law school question, Your Honor, to walk through this one.

THE COURT: So another way to put that would be, you know, yesterday we talked about the *Blockburger* case defining the prejudice analysis. And so today we might phrase it, if Three is not a predicate offense, that is, if there's a not guilty on Count Three, you still have the same analysis under *Blockburger*.

Well, if the parties don't have anything further to

say about it, the Court will rule on it.

MR. ADOLF: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I was waiting for -- I was deferring to the Government first. But I do -- I could just briefly say something about that.

I think as I understand what the Court is talking about and what my concern is, it sort of echos what I was talking about yesterday. Which is that the definition of an advertisement that the Government has proposed is so broad that it basically can include any communication even among a small group of people inviting someone to commit a crime, in particular, the crime of distributing child pornography or advertising child pornography.

And that's defined broadly enough so that if any communication can do that, that's the same as what's required for a conspiracy. Which is that communicating to someone, let's commit a crime together, and that person agreeing. So the jury can't find one without the another. There's no way to distinguish between the acts proving one and the acts proving the other because they are essentially defined the same way. And, in particular, the two counts are totally co-extensive, as far as dates.

So it is -- there is any conspiracy, which is to say, any agreement to commit a crime such as advertising is going -- any advertisement, as the Government has defined it, is going to be a component part also of the conspiracy.

There's no way to convict of one without the other. So I do think that presents a double jeopardy problem.

MS. RANDALL: Your Honor, I think if you look at just using the Blockbuster -- Blockburger -- excuse me -- Blockburger test and just looking at a straight element analysis and comparing them. If the jury were to find that the Government did not prove the advertisement charge and they said so and there's in a special verdict form that -- under the enterprise offense -- that they were not convicted based on that, then the elements would not match the conspiracy to advertise. Because they did not find that the Government acted in concert with other people or form an agreement with other people to advertise child pornography.

So if that agreement was not made for the enterprise it couldn't have been -- then it's different -- but they did find that it was made for the conspiracy, it seems like the elements would -- there would be a different element there somewhere for them not to convict on one and then the other.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

All right. We will have a verdict sheet that will be informative on this point and you all can look at that and that will be the subject of your argument to the extent you're arguing along those lines.

Anything further to be addressed about these instructions that we didn't cover yet?

MR. ADOLF: Not from the defense, Your Honor. 1 2 MS. RANDALL: Your Honor, in reviewing the 3 instructions one last time last night now that all the 4 evidence has been entered there were two that appeared to 5 maybe not be applicable anymore. One of them being page 14, 6 which was impeachment, inconsistent statements, or conduct. 7 don't think there was any use of a prior statement to impeach 8 any of the witnesses. So I don't think that one would be 9 applicable. 10 THE COURT: Any objection to removing that? 11 MR. ADOLF: Judge, I'm trying to remember, 12 mechanically, when I confronted Mr. Browning about his prior 13 statement to Agent Alfin. I'm not sure if he was really 14 impeached or if I refreshed his recollection with it as it 15 turned out. 16 MS. RANDALL: He admitted that he did say --17 MR. ADOLF: Right --18 MS. RANDALL: -- that it was --19 MR. ADOLF: Right. 20 -- that there was information about a MS. RANDALL: 21 person in Texas, which I think was what --22 I have no problem leaving it in or out. THE COURT: 23 MR. ADOLF: I think we can leave it out, Your Honor. 24 We can take it out. 25 THE COURT: All right. We'll just take it out.

MS. RANDALL: And then the other one, Your Honor, which -- and I just don't know if this would apply to Mr. Browning either, is the -- the title is the "Credibility of Witnesses, Prior Conviction." Normally I think of that as applying when you talk to someone about their criminal history. I didn't know if that would apply in this case because Mr. Browning has pled guilty. If that's why that is in there or not. Because no one else had a prior conviction that was mentioned.

THE COURT: Well, it wasn't what you might normally consider a prior but it's a felony. So I might be able to make that clear to the jury.

MS. RANDALL: And then regarding the other -- were the other changes that we discussed yesterday, then, all made about -- just so I know what I'm arguing about the interstate facility. Was that sort of definition added and everything to the final jury instructions?

THE COURT: Well, page 60, of course, is the definition of interstate or foreign commerce page in the original pagination.

MS. RANDALL: Right, but there are two mechanisms for violating the statute --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. RANDALL: -- either in or affecting commerce or using a means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce.

So we were asking for a definition of the second way of 1 2 violating the statute. 3 THE COURT: I think we came up with that. 4 Okay. We just haven't seen that final MS. RANDALL: 5 copy so I wanted to make sure before I argued to the jury. 6 THE COURT: Right. Well, we'll take a brief recess. 7 We'll just take five to ten minutes for now, and hopefully 8 we'll be able to give you a hard copy of the verdict form that 9 will be used, and a copy of the substantive part of the 10 instructions containing the modifications from yesterday. (Recess at 9:37 until 9:56.) 11 12 THE COURT: I believe the parties have a copy of the 13 verdict form. 14 MS. RANDALL: Yes, Your Honor. MR. ADOLF: Yes, Your Honor. 15 16 THE COURT: Of course that includes the predicate 17 offenses on page 2 as a special interrogatory. 18 MR. JONES: Can the Government --19 THE COURT: I believe you have a copy of the final instructions also. 20 21 MR. JONES: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: So we'll bring the jury in and I will 22 23 give them the --MR. JONES: Your Honor, just briefly before we bring 24 25 The Government just had a couple of issues with the jury in.

the special interrogatory we wanted to address. 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 MR. JONES: One is just a minor change on the 4 Advertising Child Pornography, should be between on or about August 19, 2014 and not April 14th. As the indictment charges 5 6 August 19th to March 4, 2015. 7 THE COURT: All right. Are you looking at the verdict form or --8 9 MR. JONES: The verdict form. The Special Interrogatory, page 2 of the Verdict form. 10 11 THE COURT: Page 2. Okay. It's August. MR. JONES: August 19, 2014, Your Honor. 12 13 THE COURT: You talking about the first --MR. JONES: 14 The first, yes. 15 THE COURT: -- item advertising child pornography 16 between on or about --17 MR. JONES: Should be August 19, 2014. 18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 19 MR. JONES: And the second thing, Your Honor, the 20 Government submits that the first -- the second to the last 21 sentence should be taken out "if you found that the offense of advertising child pornography was a predicate offense, skip 22 23 Count Two and continue to Count Three." 24 Your Honor, if for some reason the case were to go 25 up on appeal and there is any -- maybe an issue with the

enterprise charge, then we would still have the conspiracy to advertise. So we just admit just deleting that sentence altogether.

MS. RANDALL: Basically, Your Honor, we feel like the interrogatory, by having them check which block, is going to answer our question as to whether there's a double jeopardy issue.

MR. JONES: So it would be --

MS. RANDALL: If you instruct them not to go to Count Two and then for some reason Count One is overturned or vacated by the Court of Appeals, they find for some reason that the Government didn't prove it or the statute turns out to be unconstitutional or some other argument is made, when it comes back for resentencing at that point, Judge, you should be allowed to impose a sentence on Count Two because the double jeopardy issue no longer exists. If they're not allowed to consider it we won't know what they would have done on Count Two.

THE COURT: What do you propose to do? Just delete that sentence.

MS. RANDALL: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. JONES: Yes, Your Honor.

MS. RANDALL: We would just leave the blocks for them to check because then we would know what they were convicting him on, and Your Honor would know if there was an

actual double jeopardy issue.

MR. ADOLF: Judge, I think the same case law that the Government cited in support of the harmlessness of the error also said that -- because there are plenty of cases that say that in that exact situation, let's say where the jury convicts on Count One and then is told not to consider the lesser offense. And if that goes up on appeal and it turns out there's a defect in Count One, if that defect would not have infected Count Two then the appellate court can absolutely substitute Count Two, and there is case law to that effect. So it's the same harmless error problem.

And I think -- I'm not sure how it is that the Government thinks that the jury checking the box about what they -- that they found a particular count obviates any kind of double jeopardy problem. I think that's what causes the double jeopardy problem.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. RANDALL: I just think we know there's a double jeopardy problem if we check it.

THE COURT: I'll overrule the objection and we will leave it as it is. Is that everything?

MR. ADOLF: Judge, just for the record. I don't know if it's necessary or not, but renewing my objection to the order that the counts are considered in and the use of -- and the use of the advertising count and the possession count,

since those dates are co-extensive as being potentially 1 2 different incidents, I think I argued on Rule 29 since they 3 are all the same date they have to be the same incident and 4 therefore only one of them could be considered as a predicate. 5 I understand, Your Honor, denied that in the context of the 6 Rule 29, but I'm renewing that objection for the purpose of 7 objecting to the instructions and the special interrogatory. THE COURT: All right, sir, it will be overruled. 8 9 MR. ADOLF: Thank you.

THE COURT: May we have the jury, please?

(The jury was returned to the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Good morning, members of the jury.

THE JURY: Good morning.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: We'll proceed as we talked about yesterday. And as I indicated earlier, we'll go into jury instructions, I'll give you part of them now and then we will have the arguments of the attorneys and then we'll have the balance of the instructions before it is time for deliberation.

So now that you have heard the evidence, and you will soon hear the arguments of counsel, I will instruct you as to the law that applies to this case.

As I say, I'll give you part of it at this time.

I will first instruct you on some rules for jury consideration of cases of this type, including how to assess

the credibility of witnesses, then I will discuss the offenses charged in the particular case after the arguments. At that time I will also give you the elements of each charge and then give you some directions to guide you in your deliberations.

Can all of you hear me okay?

THE JURY: (Indicating.)

THE COURT: It is your duty and your responsibility in the trial to find the facts. You may find those facts only from the evidence which was presented during this trial. That consists of the testimony of the witnesses who have been called, and sworn and testified in your presence, the exhibits which have been admitted into evidence by the Court, and that's what you base your decisions on.

In reaching your decision as to the facts, it is your sworn duty to follow the law as the Court instructs you. You will apply the law given to you by the Court to the facts which you find from the evidence, and reach a verdict accordingly.

Now keep in mind that the Court's instructions as

I'm giving them to you will be available to you in hard copy
in the jury room and also be on the video or digital means in
the jury room. So if you wanted to look at any part of my
instructions again, you could simply do it readily in the jury
room during deliberations.

Now counsel may refer to some of the governing rules

of law in their arguments. If, however, any difference appears to you from the law as stated by counsel and that given to you by the Court, obviously, you would be following the instructions of the Court.

You are not to single out any one instruction alone as stating the law, but must consider all of the instructions as a whole. And you may not substitute or follow any personal or private notion or opinion as to what the law is or ought to be.

You are required to perform these duties without bias, or prejudice, or sympathy for or against any party. The law does not permit jurors to decide cases on the basis of bias, or prejudice, or sympathy or any perceived public opinion or any basis other than on the basis of the facts and the law that arise in this particular case.

Now this case involves seven charges brought by a Second Superseding Bill of Indictment which the Court will refer to simply as the "Bill of Indictment."

The first charge may be encapsulated by the words "Engaging in a Child Exploitation Enterprise" and that comes under the Section 2252A(g). That's Count One, Child Exploitation Enterprise is the charge.

The second charge is Conspiracy to Advertise Child Pornography, in violation of 18 U.S. Code 2251(d) and (e), that's Count Two.

The third count is Advertising Child Pornography, in violation of 18 U.S. Code 2251(d).

The next three charges are Transporting or Shipping Child Pornography, in violation of Section 2252A(a)(1), and that's Counts Four through Six.

And, finally, the seventh charge is Possession of Child Pornography, in violation of 18 U.S. Code 2252A(a)(5)(b), that's Count Seven.

So you are instructed that an indictment, the one which brings these charges, is but a formal method of accusing the defendant of a crime. In this case there are seven crimes charged. It is used to inform the defendant of the charges against him and bring him to trial. It is not evidence of any kind against the defendant, nor does it permit any presumption or inference of guilt. The indictment is not consistent either with guilt or lack of guilt. It simply puts that question at issue for your decision.

At the arraignment, the defendant entered a plea of not guilty to these charges and thereby made a general denial of all the accusations contained in the Bill of Indictment.

So it is up to you, the jury, to decide if, in fact, the defendant is guilty or not guilty of the charges outlined in the Indictment.

Now every defendant in a criminal case, and of course the defendant here, is presumed to be innocent of a

crime at the outset, and this presumption continues throughout the course of the trial. This presumption will end as to any count that you are considering, only if you reach the jury room and arrive unanimously at the conclusion, if you do, that the Government has shown to your satisfaction that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt as to that count of the indictment. This burden on the Government does not change at any time during the course of the trial. The presumption of innocence in favor of the defendant is not a mere formality to be disregarded by the jury at its pleasure. It is a substantive part of our criminal law. Accordingly, the Government must prove each of the elements of the crimes charged beyond a reasonable doubt before there could be a conviction on any particular count or counts.

Now since, at the outset, the law presumes the defendant to be innocent, the defendant begins the trial with a clean slate. The presumption of innocence is, therefore, sufficient to acquit the defendant unless overcome by evidence of guilt proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

The law permits only the evidence actually presented to the jury to be considered in support of the charge and any charge against him. If the evidence is sufficient to overcome the presumption of innocence, and to convince you beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as to a particular charge or charges, then it would be your duty to

find him guilty accordingly. But if you have a reasonable doubt as to this guilt on any charge or charges, then it would be your duty to give him the benefit of that doubt and acquit him of any such charges.

2.

Now, the Government has the burden of proving to you its contentions and each element of the offenses charged beyond a reasonable doubt.

The term "reasonable doubt" means just what it says. It is a doubt based upon reason and common sense. Its meaning is no doubt self-evident and understood by you, and the Court will not attempt to define it any further.

There are two types of evidence which a jury may properly assess in determining whether the Government has met its burden of proof as to an offense. One is direct evidence, such as testimony of an eyewitness. The other is circumstantial evidence, proof of a chain of circumstances pointing to the commission of the offense.

Circumstantial evidence is evidence of facts or circumstances from which the existence or nonexistence of other facts in controversy may be inferred. As a general rule, the law makes no distinction between direct and circumstantial evidence, it simply requires that, before convicting a defendant, the jury must be satisfied of the guilt of that defendant beyond a reasonable doubt from all the evidence in the case.

It can be said that circumstantial evidence may in some cases point to a wholly incorrect result. Yet, this is equally true of testimonial evidence. With both types of evidence, you are asked to weigh the chances that the evidence correctly points to the establishment of the facts against the possibility of inaccuracy or ambiguous inferences. With both types of evidence, you must use your experience with people and events in weighing the evidence.

A certain chart or summary and perhaps more than one has been prepared by the Government and shown to you. These have been admitted into evidence during the trial for the purpose of explaining facts that are allegedly contained in books, records, or other documents which are also in evidence in the case.

Usually this is done when there is voluminous evidence.

You may consider the charts and summaries such as you may recall from the evidence as you would any other evidence admitted during the trial and give them such weight as you feel they deserve, considering the way they are prepared and any testimony you heard about how they came about.

Now, members of the jury, where there's a question as to what took place you must determine the credibility of the witnesses. The Court instructs you that you are the sole

judges of the credibility of the witnesses and the weight that their testimony deserves. While there's no absolute or arbitrary guide or measure by which you determine the truthfulness or untruthfulness of a witness, the Court will point out to you certain general principles which you should consider as you pass upon this phase of the case. Now among the things you may properly consider are:

Whether the witness has any motive or reason for being truthful or untruthful; the witness' interest, if any, in the outcome of the case; whether there has appeared from the witness's attitude or conduct any bias or prejudice or feeling which may cause that person's testimony to be influenced; whether the testimony bears the earmarks of truthfulness; to what extent, if any, the testimony is corroborated or confirmed by other testimony which is not questioned, or to what extent, if any, it's corroborated or confirmed by known or admitted facts; you may also consider the intelligence and mental capacity of a witness and the witness' opportunity to have accurate knowledge of the matters to which the person testified.

So I instruct you that you may believe all that a witness says or none, you may believe part and disbelieve part. You may consider the interest which the witness may have in the verdict, the demeanor of the witness on the stand, the reasons for his or her testimony, and the means by which

the witness may know the things to which he or she has testified. If you find a witness is interested in your verdict, it is your duty to scrutinize that testimony closely, but after you've done so and if you find he or she is telling the truth in whole or in part, then you would give that testimony the same weight you would that of a disinterested witness. In short, it is your duty to find the truth of this matter.

The Defendant, Steven W. Chase, has elected not to testify in this case. The Court instructs you that the defendant has a constitutional right not to take the stand and testify and not to speak at all or offer any evidence, the burden of proof being entirely upon the Government. Thus, you must draw no adverse inference of any kind from his exercise of his privilege not to testify. This right is a fundamental one in America's criminal law and one which cannot be disregarded by the jury at its pleasure.

Now you heard the testimony of a witness who has been convicted of a felony. That is, you heard Witness Browning indicate that he had pled guilty to a charge in the indictment here. Now, that could be a crime for which a person may receive a prison sentence of more than one year. Prior conviction of a crime that is a felony is one of the circumstances that you may consider in determining the credibility of a witness. While the testimony of a witness

maybe discredited or impeached by evidence showing that he has been convicted of a felony, it is the sole and exclusive right of the jury to determine the weight to be given to any prior conviction as impeachment and the weight to be given to the testimony of someone who has previously been convicted of a felony.

Now, the testimony of an alleged accomplice, that is, someone who said that he participated in the commission of a crime must be examined and weighed by the jury with greater care than the testimony of a witness who did not so participate.

David Lynn Browning may be considered an alleged accomplice in this case.

The fact that an alleged accomplice has entered a plea of guilty to the offense charged is not evidence of the guilt of any other person, including the defendant.

The jury must determine whether the testimony of an accomplice has been affected by self-interest, by an agreement made with the Government, or by his own interest in the outcome of the case, or by prejudice against the defendant.

You have heard the evidence that witness David Lynn
Browning has pled guilty to the crime which arose out of the
same events for which he is on trial here -- or for which,
rather, the defendant is on trial. You must not consider that
guilty plea as any evidence of this defendant's guilt. You

may consider that witness's guilty plea only for determining the truthfulness that you would attribute, or lack of it, and whether you would rely on that testimony.

The rules of evidence ordinarily do not permit witnesses to testify as to their own opinions or their own conclusions about important issues in a trial.

An exception to this rule exists as to those witnesses who are described as "expert witnesses."

An "expert witness" is someone who, by education or experience, may have become knowledgeable in some technical, scientific, or very specialized area. If such knowledge or experience may be of assistance to you in understanding some of the evidence or in determining a fact, then an "expert witness" in that area may state an opinion as to a matter in which he or she claims to be an expert.

You should consider the expert opinions received in evidence in this case, that is, the testimony of Daniel O'Donnell concerning conducting investigations into online child exploitation websites; the testimony of Ray Hus concerning digital media forensics; and the testimony of Jon Shumway concerning digital media forensics, and give that testimony such weight as you think it deserves.

You should consider the testimony of the expert witness just as you consider other evidence in the case. If you should decide that the opinion of the witness is not based

upon sufficient education or experience, or if you should conclude that the reasons given in support of the opinion are not sound, or if you should conclude that the opinion is outweighed by other evidence, then you may disregard that opinion in part or in its entirety.

As I have told you before, you are the sole judges of the facts.

Now, during the trial you heard testimony from those Government witnesses I just mentioned, O'Donnell, Shumway, and Hus, and these were qualified as experts, but they were also involved in the investigation into the PlayPen website. To the extent these witnesses, or any of them, rendered opinions regarding investigations into online child exploitation websites and digital media forensics generally, including opinions about the t-o-r network, terminology used on online child exploitation websites, and the copying of digital media images, you should treat this testimony as expert testimony. To the extent these witnesses also provided testimony about their involvement in the investigation into the PlayPen website, this testimony is not expert testimony and should be considered fact witness testimony, just as any other witness.

Your decision on the facts of this case should not be determined by the number of witnesses testifying for or against any party. You should consider all the facts and circumstances in evidence to determine which of the witnesses

you choose to believe or not to believe.

Keep in mind that the defendant is not on trial for any offense not charged in this Bill of Indictment. Nor should you draw any inference concerning guilt or lack of guilt of any crime charged in this case based on evidence, if there was any, of the defendant's involvement with any other offense not charged in this Bill of Indictment.

You must not convict the defendant unless the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt each and every essential element of the particular crime charged in the Bill of Indictment against him which you are considering.

Now, you may use the notes if you took any during the trial. However, because many courts do not permit notetaking by jurors, a word of caution is in order.

Frequently, there is a tendency to attach too much importance to what a person writes down. You are instructed that your notes are only a tool to aid your own individual memory, and should not be substituted for your memory. Moreover, you should not compare your notes with those of other jurors in determining the content of testimony or in evaluating the importance of any evidence. Remember, your notes are not evidence, and are by no means a complete outline of the proceedings or a list of the highlights of the trial. Your memory should be your greatest asset when it comes to this case in deciding it. If your memory should differ from your

notes, then you would rely on your memory and not on your notes.

2.

Now the punishment provided by law for the offense charged in the various ones in the indictment, should there be a verdict of guilty of any offense, is a matter exclusively within the province of the Court. The idea of punishment should never be considered by the jury in any way in arriving at an impartial verdict as to the guilt or innocence of the accused as to any count or counts.

Thank you very much for your attention to these matters. We will now move to arguments.

Under our rules the Government has the opportunity to make an opening statement or, rather, a summation statement to you at this time. And then the defendant will have an opportunity to present arguments on behalf of the defendant and, of course, defense counsel may also refer to arguments made by the Government in reply. And, finally, the Government will have a brief opportunity to respond to defense arguments.

Is the Government ready to proceed?

MS. RANDALL: We are, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You may do so.

MS. RANDALL: Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, over the past few days you have learned about one of the darkest corners of what's known as the Dark Web. A place where sexual abuse of

children is celebrated and even adored by hundreds of thousands of users; that place was PlayPen.

PlayPen was a website dedicated to people who wanted to share and seek out child pornography. It was a website that was created and maintained from August of 2014 until February 20, 2015, by a user named PlayPen. So who exactly is PlayPen? Well, despite his attempts to hide and even mislead others on the website and through his records, there is clear evidence that PlayPen is only one man, the Defendant Steven Chase. So let's examine the evidence that shows the defendant Steven Chase's PlayPen.

In December of 2014 you heard the FBI got a lead that helped him discover that the PlayPen website was being housed on a server here in Lenoir, North Carolina, a place called CentriLogic. They issued numerous subpoenas and legal process to this particular company in an attempt to find out what they could about who was running this website. And all the information that they received took them directly to the defendant. Let's look at what they received.

So as I said, if you look at the upper left hand corner of the graphic in front of you, the Playpen website, it took them to CentriLogic.

CentriLogic provided them with records that included the last log-in to the customer account that was responsible for the PlayPen website, and that included an IP address that

was being used by 3119 Carrabassett Drive in Carrabassett Valley, Maine. Who was staying at the house at the time the account was being logged into? The Defendant, Steven Chase.

CentriLogic also showed that the account that was maintaining the PlayPen website was in the name of someone named Mike Taylor in Austin, Texas. The investigation revealed that name and address to be fictitious. And no one was surprised by this because no one expected anyone to use their real name to be used to set up an account to be used to house child pornography.

But the account still had to be paid for. So they tracked the records for who was paying for the server space to maintain the child pornography website and that took them to PayPal. And those records from PayPal, they again reviewed the IP addresses. And just to refresh your recollection, IP addresses are kind of an individualized phone number for a person's computer that will allow the agents to trace it back to a certain account.

In this case they learned that the PayPal account was being accessed from two different places they could find. One being, again, the 3119 Carrabassett Drive residence in Maine. The other being a residence in Naples, Florida. What do those two residences have in common? The Defendant, Steven Chase.

Now an email address was also used to sign up for

the server space to house the Playpen website. The IP address logs for the email address that was used were also examined. And guess what the agents found again? The email account was being accessed from 3119 Carrabassett Drive in Maine and the Naples, Florida residence. Again, what is the one unifying factor about those residences? The Defendant, Steven Chase.

And then, finally, the actual PlayPen administrator account was logged into directly from an IP address that could be traced. When the agents traced that address they came back to the address in Naples, Florida. And who lives in that house? The Defendant Steven Chase.

So no matter which lead the FBI followed, it always went straight to the defendant.

Now you've heard a lot about the IP addresses in this case. And, unfortunately, a lot of the IP address in this case were unable to be traced. Because -- not traced, they were not helpful or necessarily reliable because they came back to VPNs which are Virtual Private Networks or Tor nodes. And as you heard, those are two mechanisms that people use to hide their location when using the internet. But we do know that the defendant was using the VPN software as well as Tor.

So after the agents had gathered all this information they executed a search warrant at the defendant's residence in Naples, Florida. And the evidence they found in

that home only solidified what they already knew, that the defendant was PlayPen.

Just after midnight on February 20th, they attempted to enter the home in Naples, Florida. And as they -- as you heard from Special Agent Baugher about how they approached the house with the intent to do a no-knock search warrant but they were compromised when they saw the defendant through the window.

So as they attempted to enter the home, Special Agent Baugher is yelling, "Police. Search warrant." As he's yelling that, Chase is fighting two agents to keep them from entering his home. And he puts up a good fight. There are two agents pushing on the door with Mr. Chase pushing back against them. But the two agents do eventually win the fight and the FBI enter the home. Even after the FBI are in the home and actually fallen on top of Mr. Chase, he continues to struggle to get away and is seen lurching towards his laptop computer. This computer that the SWAT team was there to try and protect.

So why would someone try to fight FBI agents to keep a door closed; then when they do make entry, lurch towards their computer? That's someone who knows that all the evidence that is needed to convict him was not only on the computer, but was opened and obvious to anyone who just walked up to the computer.

If Mr. Chase could just get to that computer that day he could have pulled out the thumb drive, encrypting it, and shutting computer and hopefully, at least, keeping the FBI from finding some of the evidence against him. But luckily he didn't make it there and the agents were able to secure the computer, the thumb drive, as well as his cell phone and conduct examinations on the items that they recovered that day.

Let's look first at the computer, the items he was trying so hard to get to.

When the agents approached the computer this is what they saw. The defendant was actively logged into the PlayPen profile, the administrator of the website. You can clearly see on the screen the first forum that is visible to someone looking at the computer is the Administration forum. A forum that's only available to the people who are the administrators and moderators of the website.

And on the upper right hand corner -- I know it's hard to see in this picture but you can remember the closer up picture, you see that where he was logged in as PlayPen.

Also on this computer the agents discovered he was actually logged into the server, the administration kind of server that's used to maintain the website.

And as you can also see in this picture there's a thumb drive that's attached to the laptop. And open on the

computer when the agents approached was a file titled "PP_2."

So at the moment the agents entered this house, while this computer was logged into the administrative account of PlayPen, while they were logged into the administrative part of the server that housed PlayPen, and a file containing the most relevant information to operating the website was open, the defendant was also operating a very effective antivirus anti mal-ware program. A program that was so good and so strong that when the FBI attempted to conduct an on-scene forensic, it immediately detected the program and actually deleted the program from the forensic examiner's thumb drive.

So once the computer was seized you heard about the process it went through to be analyzed. And after it was analyzed they found numerous pieces of information on the computer linked to the PlayPen website. Again, this is the defendant's computer. First, they found various forums on the PayPal website had been visited from this computer. They could tell this by looking at the browser history. If you visit a website it leaves a little -- a track on your computer so the computer knows you've been there.

So in this case they were able to tell that someone using that computer had been to the Administration forum of the PlayPen website, the "Preteen Videos Girls HC" section, and the "Preteen Video Boys HC" section, and the "Preteen Girl

Chan" section. They also found bookmarks on the computer.

Now bookmarks are not something that's created by the computer such as the browser history. Bookmarks are something that are user created. A person accessing the computer has to choose to save a website as a bookmark. It's a way to get there quicker, it's a shortcut.

So in this case the user of this computer wanted a shortcut to three specific sites. One, the PlayPen index. That was the picture we showed you that listed all the forums that the website had to offer. The second was the PlayPen image hosting, and the third was the PlayPen file hosting. The other two parts of the website that helped it to run together.

They also found Google searches relevant to child pornography in the PlayPen website. They found a person using this computer had searched for the PlayPen web address. They searched for the search term "Siberian Mouse." What's significant about that? That's not a term someone normally searches for. You wouldn't know that kind of term was associated with child pornography unless you're someone who's been involved with child pornography and extremely familiar with it to know that that term will take you to somewhere where you could find child pornography.

He also searched child porn on Netflix and Tor, which as you heard, PlayPen was a website on Tor.

But that's not the only evidence the Government found on the computer. They found an actual screen shot -- well, actually, I'll come back to that in a minute. I'm going to show you the screen shot.

They also found child pornography in the recycle bin of the defendant's computer, one video and one image. They also found the PlayPen logo actually in the defendant's recycle bin as well.

Actually they found a screen shot of the actual PlayPen saved to the defendant's computer. This is not like the undercover session the FBI captured. That's a picture that was created by the user of the laptop and saved to the laptop. And it shows that the person on the laptop was logged into the Administration section of the PlayPen website, and in the process of posting a reply about a logo contest. It also shows the computer had the VPN software, Tor, and some other software programs.

Now they also conducted an examination of the thumb drive that was attached to the defendant's computer, as well as the defendant's cell phone.

Look first at the thumb drive. First of all they found over 8,900 files depicting child abusive and exploitive material. They also found backup copies of the PlayPen website. And even more kind of unusual, something that was -- they found that was, I don't think -- that was kind of a

surprise, was a "Stuff" file. This file contained the text
that actually gave you directions on how to create,
specifically, the PlayPen website on Tor as a hidden service.
These aren't just general directions for how to create a
website or even how to create a website on Tor. It's how to
create the PlayPen website on Tor. That was saved to the
defendant's encrypted thumb drive.

There was also another file entitled, "PP_2." This was a file actually opened when the agents executed the search warrant. And this -- there was plenty of information in this file. I just picked out a couple of pieces here to highlight.

If you look at the top right corner of the screen it shows the Mike T. Yahoo address with the -- underneath it, at ##MINE9999##. As you know through the evidence, the Mike T. email address was the email address associated with the account used to house -- that created the PlayPen server. It was also the email address that was associated with the PayPal account that was paying for the server space to allow the PlayPen server to exist.

Then following up with the rest of the investigative information, Mike Taylor 2403 West 8th Street, Austin, Texas. That is the fictitious identity the defendant assumed to create this account. That is the information that was in the Playpen -- the PayPal records, as well as the CentriLogic records that were used to maintain this website. That

information was found in this file on the defendant's encrypted thumb drive.

Similar next to it is the PayPal -- it shows the PayPal information that it was using the Mike T. Yahoo account and had the password underneath it.

And then below that in the same file there was a link that took you to -- that showed the billing area of the CentriLogic server, and, again, had the email address that was used to set up the child pornography website we're here for today.

Now if you look at each of those entries, what matches between them besides the email address is that ##MINE9999## which creates some sort of password, is what we're inferring from the position of that and how it is associated with each of those accounts. Do you remember where we saw that in another place? In the defendant's home on a piece of paper pinned to a bulletin board. He had a list of different accounts, and for all of them you can see clearly the MINE9999 written out over and over again on a piece of paper found in his home.

Then finally in that "PP_ 2" account, the one last thing I want to draw your attention to is, it actually had links to the "Hard Candy Hidden Wiki" site. And as you heard from several different witnesses, "Hard Candy" was sort of an index for people to use to find child pornography websites.

Continue to go on the "PP_2" file, there is even more information related to PlayPen. It had different URLs or website addresses and user IDs. Again, all associated with PlayPen.

If you look at the defendant's personal cell phone there was also information on there linking him to PlayPen. These were Google searches that were pulled from the defendant's cell phone showing his cell phone had been used to search for "PlayPen.onion, Playpen CP Tor Onion." And you heard CP stands for child pornography in these cases. And again, "Playpen.onion." So someone was using the defendant's phone to actually conduct searches that would take them to the Playpen website that could be found on Google.

Now the defendant had brought up hacking and mal-ware through several of the witnesses asking them questions about that. There seemed to be a suggestion that somebody else took over the defendant's computer remotely controlling it to commit the crime.

But what they're actually suggesting is that someone was able to hack into the defendant's computer while he was running antivirus software, remotely control it, put evidence of the crime on the computer, put evidence of the crime on his encrypted hard drive, and put evidence of the crime on his phone. Oh, and it just so happens that the password -- or excuse me, the password used by the hacker who created this

supposed website, also knew the password that the defendant had written down on a piece of paper in his house.

The fact is, there's been no evidence of any mal-ware or virus on the defendant's computer. And the fact is, internet activity was being monitored at various times at both the times he was in the residence in Naples and in Maine.

And as you heard Special Agent Dan Alfin testify that there was no evidence of hacking or remote control of anyone remotely accessing the defendant's computer in any of those logs. So any suggestion of a hacker putting this information on the computer, his phone, or his encrypted thumb drive is mere speculation.

When you look at all of this evidence, it's clear there's only one person who can be the administrator of PlayPen, and that's Steven Chase.

So now that we know who PlayPen is, let's look at the charges that he's facing. As you heard the defendant or, excuse me, the Judge told you about seven different charges he's facing ranging from enterprise, conspiracy to advertise, advertise, three counts of transportation and possession. I'm actually going to start with possession and work my way back up.

And the Judge is going to instruct you after the arguments about the elements of these crimes and what the law is. What I'm going to do here is kind of give you a quick

summary of the law so we can talk about how the evidence applies to it.

So as I said we're going to talk about possession of child pornography first.

Possession of child pornography is when a person knowingly possesses material that contains at least one image of child pornography, knew it was child pornography, and that the child pornography in or affected interstate or foreign commerce or used a means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce.

So what is child pornography? Child pornography is a visual depiction of a person under the age of 18 engaged in sexually explicit conduct. And sexually explicit conduct, as the Judge will instruct you, can range from different things. It can be vaginal penetration, oral penetration, bestiality, masturbation, also includes lewd and lascivious display of the genitals of the child.

So he'll instruct you as to that definition, that's generally what you should be looking for in deciding if something is child pornography.

So what is possession?

Well, there's several different kinds of possession.

There's actual possession or there's constructive possession.

Right now I'm in actual possession of this computer. I'm

manipulating it, controlling it, moving it around. You can

see me doing that.

I'm in constructive possession of my computer back at my house. I have a key to get to my house. I know the password to get on the computer. And I know what's stored on there, there are pictures, there are documents, there's all sorts of information on there that if I want to I can go home and put in my password and delete some of the pictures, move the pictures to the folder, email some pictures. So even though I don't have the computer here with me, I'm still in constructive possession of it because I've got the means and the ability to exert control over that computer.

There's also joint versus sole possession.

Sole possession is when you possess something alone. But the law also recognizes joint possession where you possess stuff with other people, more than one person can possess an item.

And then when I talk about the interstate and foreign commerce, or a means of interstate -- or excuse me, a means or facility of interstate commerce, that's things such as traveling across state lines, sending a photograph via the internet crosses state lines. The internet, just by itself is a means of interstate -- excuse me, is a facility of interstate or foreign commerce.

So in this case the defendant was in constructive possession of all of the child pornography that was on the

PlayPen website. As the main administrator he exerted the ultimate control over it. Other people may upload most of the pictures, but he could delete them. He could move them. He could download them and save them.

2.

In fact, he acknowledges this fact as much in his posts where someone says to him, "The new file hoster is great news for us and great news for the admin of PlayPen. You don't have to download CP anymore, because we are now going to be sending it all to you."

So they're saying by you controlling the website you don't have to go looking for it. We're just going to give it to you then you have it.

So PlayPen acknowledges, "That's why" happy face "that's why I asked uploaded files be encrypted and password."

The Government must also show that at least one of the images depicted a minor under the age of 12. We presented multiple images to the jury that would meet that definition. I'm not going to show you the images again. They will available if anybody needs to look at them to determine if the Government has met its burden. But for now I'm just going to describe them to refresh your memory.

First of all there was a toddler video we showed you that contained three separate images of three children under the age of two whose genitals were displayed in lewd and lascivious manner. There was a puppy thread which was a

series of photos with a very young girl children, was clearly under the age of 12, having her genitals exposed. And then, finally, there was the "My Pee Collection" three images -- series of images we showed you. That was the thread that was last accessed by the defendant before his arrest. And those images also depicted young girls engaged in both urination and lewd and lascivious display of their genitals.

So, ladies and gentlemen, that's the evidence that you need to convict the defendant of possession.

The defendant is also charged with transportation of child pornography. He faces three counts. The three counts of transportation are based on at least three threads we showed you during the trial. The transportation of child pornography involves the defendant knowingly transported or moving, either across state lines or in and affecting interstate or foreign commerce by using any means or facility of interstate commerce, such as the interstate, a visual depiction of child engaged in sexually explicit conduct.

So we showed you each of these three threads as the basis for those charges. In each of these threads the defendant is using the internet to transport child pornography through a server here in North Carolina where then he made it available to anyone who wants to see it. So by using the internet to conduct his crime and send these images and videos, he is clearly meeting the element of interstate and

foreign commerce.

So let's look at the first one on its own. The PlayPen hosting thread. Again, I won't show them to you, but they will be available to you if you want to actually pull up a thread and look at any of the images or videos. But that's the thread where someone reported, "Hey Admin, I'm having some trouble getting to these photos, these are links, I can't get to them. The defendant PlayPen responds and posts three series — they call them contact sheets, those little previews. Posted three series of photos depicting prepubescent children engaged in various sex acts. He's the one who made that available on the server in North Carolina by posting it on there. So not only is the person responding to, but any other user on the website who happened to click on that thread.

Count Five is a thread titled "Web Cam Three Girls."

This is a thread that was posted in the: Preteen Video Girls

HC" section. As you heard, HC stands for hard core. The

defendant created this thread himself. In it he used it to

share the video of three minor females undressing and dancing

in front of a camera, and the girls exposing their genitals

over and over to the camera.

Another user replies, the defendant posts, "Thanks muchly."

Count Six is also posted in the "Preteen Video Girls

HC" section. And, again, in this case the defendant is uploading, through the North Carolina server, links to show that, to allow other people to access a video called "NattyDatty 8 YO." That was the video that depicted a girl no older than eight years old. You heard from the agent who actually met her. He met her, she is eight years old, being raped by her father. A video that was produced in Hawaii, and then unfortunately they are disseminated afterwards so that they then end up in the defendant's possession and he could then host it for over 100,000 people to view and comment on.

Moving next to the advertisement charge.

Advertising child pornography. The first thing you may think of is a radio or a television where you hear ads and see commercials. Those are ads. But the Judge is going to instruct you as to what the legal definition of what an ad is in this type of case.

Clearly you're not going to find a television commercial for child pornography. Child pornography ads are going to be more discrete. They're going to be more secret where only people who are looking for them will find them and hopefully law enforcement will not find them. But basically under the law someone advertises child pornography when they alert other people to where it is with the intent of attracting them to it, showing that -- letting them know it's there or letting them know what they're looking for also

qualifies as advertisement.

So you don't have to just be sharing. When you say, I'm looking for this particular image or video, and that is also advertising because you are putting a notice out that you are seeking child pornography. It doesn't have to be for sale, it just simply has to be something that calls another person's attention to it.

So for an advertisement charge we have to show the defendant did some sort of notice or offer to receive, display, or distribute a visual depiction of a minor engaged in sexual explicit conduct. That they used a facility of interstate or foreign commerce, or that it was transported in interstate or foreign commerce. And, again, the internet is using the interstate commerce.

So let's look at the evidence that the defendant engaged in advertisement of child pornography.

PlayPen was an online child pornography bulletin board. Anyone could join this board as you heard. They had to find it. They had to be looking for it. But then once they found it, anyone could find it. And a lot of people found it, over 100,000 different accounts were created on this website.

This website was designed to allow people to share and seek out the child pornography that they desired. You heard one of the -- Mr. Browning, who was Stretch Armstrong on

the website, testify that in this community of people who like child pornography, that even within that community they have some preferences. They still have likes and dislikes. Some people may prefer boys, other people may prefer girls, or certain types of child pornography.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So in order to accommodate that when Mr. Chase set up the website. He set it up so people wanting to see child pornography could find what they were looking for. He created a different forum ranging from "Jailbait," to "Toddler," to "Chubby," "Incest." There was even a "Request" thread where people could post their request for what they were looking for and other people could help them find them. And then within those forums there were sub-forums. And so what I put up here now on the screen is an example of the sub-forum for the "Girls Hard Core" section within the "Preteen Videos." So as you can see, when you go into the sub-forum there's a list of threads available within that forum. You still don't see the pictures or videos, you just see titles. Titles that are advertising what's within them. Those are titles that are specifically created by the person who is creating the thread to say what they are either distributing or what they are seeking.

And these forums are maintained by the administrators and moderators to make sure the subject matter remained true to what the forum topic said it would be.

1 2

The defendant, like others, distributed child pornography through these forums. For example, we just talked about this thread. This is the thread that was the "Web Cam Three Girls" that the defendant posted in the "Girls Hard Core" forum area we were just looking at.

So in creating the thread, the defendant created a thread called "Web Cam Three Girls." So that anyone visiting the "Girls Hard Core" section would have gone to a website like this and seen "Web Cam Three Girls" created by PlayPen. And they would see this title in this section, and they would know that that thread was offering to share with them a web cam video depicting three pre-teen girls engaged in hard core child pornography.

So using just those three words, "Three Girls Web Cam," putting it in this context in this setting, the defendant published and noticed to all the users of the website, as we established, thousands and thousands of individuals, that he was offering to distribute that type of video to all of them.

And clearly his ad was successful, because if you look at the ad, the thread was read 8,453 times. So this title is clear and quite enticing and brought a lot of attraction to his ad.

Conspiracy to advertise child pornography, we have to prove the advertisement. But we have to prove the

defendant agreed with somebody else to commit this crime. And in this case he clearly conspired with at least one other person to commit this crime. They agree that they were going to violate the law, the advertising of child pornography together.

When the defendant created PlayPen, he was no longer the administrator. Mr. Browning had told you that. But as the website grew, he added to his team. He brought in more administrators as reflected here, we have Vitellius and Isabella. He added moderators including Stretch Armstrong, the defendant Mr. Browning, and a number of other individuals. And below that were local moderators who have control over individual websites.

Together these people jointly agreed that they wanted to create a website safe for people who wanted to offer to distribute, receive, and seek out child pornography.

Together they implemented rules. They didn't want any hurt core video. They were okay with hard core but not hurt core.

They maintained the forums together. They moved things around to popular forums.

You saw some of the postings, Would "this qualify as hurt core? Should we create this kind of forum?" Those kind of conversations were going on in a special administration section where they spoke with each other. They ensured by working together that the ads and notices they posted, both

themselves and other people, would be in the proper context to send the message they wanted to send.

The defendant was an active part of this conspiracy. At the time the undercover went into his "Stats" page, the defendant had been on the website a total of more than 12 days. That's a lot of hours. I'm not going to try and do the math. He created more than 200 posts by that time.

Now we don't have to show that the defendant was the most active. We don't have to show he was the leader of the conspiracy, but that he, in fact, formed an agreement with other people to commit this crime.

He participated in the "Admin" section, as I mentioned, discussing the running of the website. Here are examples of two of the posts he made in that section. One in which he reaches out and thanks the other people, the other administrators and moderators for their hard work saying, that "PlayPen looks great. Without you this never would have happened."

So clearly they're working together because the PlayPen website was a success at this point. Talks about the number of members they have. Even though he pruned members not logged in, he still had 138,000. Then talks to them a little bit about his went vacation.

In the second post he's responding to Stretch

Armstrong's post, Mr. Browning's post where he's asking, "What

do you think I should do about this video? I think it qualifies as hurt core. Is that the type of thing we want in our forum? Should I remove it?"

And the Defendant Chase issues him basically an order, "Just delete it. Just give him a reason why." So clearly they're all working together to make sure the board is the type of board where people can find certain types of child pornography.

The final charge the defendant is facing is engaging in child exploitation enterprise. This charge encompasses a lot of the other charges we talked about, the three transportation charges, the advertisement charge, and the possession charges, which is why I started with those explanations first.

So we have to show that the defendant committed three or more separate offenses that violated Chapter 110, which include Counts Three through Seven that I just went through, that three or more offenses involved more than one victim, and that the defendant committed those offenses with three or more people. Otherwise we have to show he was acting in concert. It's very similar to the conspiracy idea we went through where you make an agreement with someone to violate the law.

So if you break those down to individual elements to see if we met them, as I said, first you look at whether there

are three separate offenses. We provided you with five that the defendant has committed. The law requires that you be unanimous as to at least three of those being committed by the defendant.

Second, that there was more than one victim. If you look at those five counts, ladies and gentlemen, there's clearly more than one victim. You have the victim from Hawaii, you have the three girls in the web cam video, you have the young children in the response that Mr. Chase made, and then the possession count we talked about three different kids in the "Toddler" section, there was the bondage image. So clearly there was more than one child.

Finally, that he and at least three other people agreed that they and perhaps others would violate the laws by a means of common plan or course of action. Now, we're not required to show that three people committed each of the predicate offenses. But just as the defendant was committing at least three predicate offenses, he acted in concert with three different people, so that could be one on each.

This is a website with over 100,000 members who had a common goal as we discussed. This massive website was maintained and organized by a team who helped each other and other members to accomplish a common goal. Mr. Browning, as you heard, was an active member of that team. You saw his stats. He was online a lot. He stayed online some five to

six hours a day on this website. And he offered up this analogy to how the website worked.

He said, "It works like a restaurant." There's a manager who would be Mr. Chase. He created the website. He paid for the server space. He set the original rules. He had the ultimate power to shut the website down at any time. And he had assistant managers Vitellius, and Isabella, who you heard was an individual named Michael Fluckiger who helped him, and they were kind of second step down in hierarchy. And then there were the shift leaders of the restaurant who he analogized as being like a moderator, he and other people who implemented the rules that were set up by the administrators.

The defendant relied on this team that he put together to make sure that the child pornography that he jointly possessed and controlled fit within his rules and regulations. Much like the manager of a restaurant relies on his employees to make sure the restaurant runs smoothly. And together they worked to keep this board orderly so that when the defendant posted his threads, people knew what was being offered. And by working together they ensured that the defendant had what he wanted, a place to share his child pornography with other people. After all, at one point Mr. Browning said, "PlayPen was the only game in town where people went to get child pornography on Tor."

We also provided you other postings that showed how

the defendant interacted with other members creating rating scales, putting in new moderators and buying more space for child pornography. They were working together to achieve a goal.

As the defendant said in one posting, "There should be a place in this world for CP." That's what he wanted and that's what they were all working towards. He designed it that way, and he recruited others to help him facilitate the sharing of child pornography among people interested in that material. In doing so, they in return gave Chase a place where he could advertise, share, and possess child pornography.

Ladies and gentlemen, the evidence before you is clear, the Defendant Steven Chase is PlayPen. The evidence is also clear that he is guilty on all charges. Thank you.

THE COURT: Any of the jurors care for a break before we go to the arguments on the defendant?

THE JURY: (No response.)

THE COURT: All right. You may proceed, sir.

MR. ADOLF: Thank you, Your Honor. Morning folks.

THE JURY: Morning.

MR. ADOLF: I don't know what she's talking about.

I am not saying that somebody secretly slipped a bunch of child pornography on to Mr. Chase's computer. That was his account. You saw the evidence of that. You saw what they

found in his house. It was supposed to be his account. It was supposed to stay his account. What happened was, it was hacked and other people were doing things using that account. That's what I'm saying. That's what the evidence points to that you saw here.

I told you Tuesday morning, I guess it was, computers don't lie. Computers don't commit crimes.

Computers don't make decisions before they should, but people do all those things. People lie, people sometimes make decisions before they should, before they know everything that's going on. And the Government just talked about all the things that some hacker would have needed to know to get information off of Mr. Chase's computer or put it on there.

None of that is true. You heard the FBI confirmed it. All somebody needed to know was username and password and they could take over that account. And you'll see we'll go through some of the evidence that the Government doesn't want you to look at, that they haven't shown you, that shows that is what happened.

You see, the FBI wasn't looking for clues about somebody else using the account. You heard Agent Alfin say he had traced the payment to Mr. Chase. They went into his house. They saw he had the site open that was it. The investigation was over.

When you start to see things, those logs that I

talked about showing that there were log-ins come from other places, from other computers, using other accounts that could be traced. That's all information the FBI didn't have when they targeted Mr. Chase. That was information they didn't have yet when they went into his house and pulled him out and saw the computer there.

The reality is, the first people ever to sit and see all the evidence from before, from after, are all of you.

That's why we have this jury system that we have. Because it's up to somebody when the case is all over, when everything is all in, to take a fresh look at everything, not trying to favor one side or the other, not making up their minds, not saying, for instance, like Agent Alfin said when I asked him, "Well, why didn't you try to go see where these other postings came from?" Right, those people had to have accounts too.

Where is that?

He was candid at least, he said, "Well, we got our man already. I didn't see the need to do it." Well, they didn't have those logs. That's the information you have that they didn't.

I'm not faulting them for doing what they do. Law enforcement's job is to try to catch people. They have to do things on the fly. They have to concentrate their resources. It's at the end of the day when we can all sit back and look at what's been alleged, and look through the things that maybe

they didn't want you to pay attention to and make your own decisions.

And I think it was telling when the Government just said now, "every lead the Government followed went to Mr. Chase." Not that every lead went to Mr. Chase. But every lead they followed. We're going to talk a little bit about the leads they didn't follow that you heard Agent Alfin and I talked about.

Can you show me Defense 1. Put that up, please.

This is one of the posts that we talked about that the FBI didn't know about when they first targeted Mr. Chase.

Can you blow up the text of that? Thank you.

You'll have all this evidence available to you in the back if you want to look at it. And just to get it out of the way, I'm not going to show you any pornography while we're out here. This and other exhibits will be available to you in the back so you don't have to remember it.

But I just point out the date and time of that

August 25th, 2014, at 5:00 on whatever time scale that is.

That's a post in Russian. And Agent Alfin was asked that.

Mr. Chase posting that? Does he know Russian? Ever been to

Russia? Make contact with anybody in Russia? Did you find

searches in Russian on his computer or anything like that? He

said, "Well, anybody can go on Google translate." But why?

Why is -- if they're saying that was Mr. Chase posting that,

what's he doing posting things in Russian?

You got to remember something, and I think it was important to listen to some of what Mr. Browning said yesterday that, yes, this was all secret. And, yes, all these people had to keep this information secret from each other. But this was the one place that they felt like they could really safely talk about anything they wanted to. It was like their little confessional booth, I guess if you want to call it that. Really the opposite. It's not to absolve their sins but magnify them. Be that as it may, they were free to say whatever they wanted to. They weren't trying to -- for the one time not trying to hide everything from anybody about what they were about and what they were doing. Nobody is posting that to try to pose as a Russian. That is somebody in control of the PlayPen account who is comfortable in Russian and is participating in a Russian discussion.

And, you know what, if they're trying to say that Mr. Chase somehow is just posting in all kinds of languages, why is it only that one? You saw that there are discussion groups in Dutch, in Spanish, and Italian, from all over the world. Why Russian?

Show me Government's Exhibit 18.

Right there in front of you you have a little more in depth profile of whoever it is that's using the PlayPen account. And that tells you more detail about what this

account has done.

Can you zoom in on that bottom right corner?

What this tells you is where is this PlayPen person spending most of their time? What little sections of the website are they actually concentrating on?

"Information and Rules," I guess that's important if you're working on the site and "How To, General Discussions."

Before you even get down to any kind of particular fetishes or interests, that person -- that person's fourth most favorite place to be active is in the Russian department. Somebody who doesn't speak Russian, never been there, is posting routinely in some sort of Russian group, even more than they are talking about child pornography?

And remember Agent Alfin's answer to that. When you're talking about, like, what leads were pursued and what weren't. I asked him about that and he said, Well, I don't -- I don't think the website is really calculating things right. That's some sort of flaw. So I guess the computer is lying like people, is what he's telling me.

And so you know what? When Mr. Hsu got on, the analyst, to testify, I asked him, Anybody check? You had the whole website sitting there. They showed you the servers. They pulled the entire thing out of Lenoir, took it to Washington or Maryland and looked at it. Is there any indication -- and I think what I said was, "Did anyone ask you

to check if there were any anomalies in the counter function?"

Lots of you probably been on websites. A lot of times you'll see businesses, particularly small businesses are looking for people to want to visit the site and try to sell things and so forth, will have a little counter on the bottom that tells you "This website has been visited 650 times." It goes up every time someone clicks on it. These are automatic features that plenty of websites have. And the bulletin boards like that, it's just a standard part of the package.

Why do we think that some bulletin board is not working right? And why do we not check? And the answer is, because we don't want the answer we're going to get. The answer we're going to get is, it's working the way it's designed to work, and the way it's always worked. And somebody is spending a lot of time doing Russian stuff.

And what's interesting also about that post is where it came from. One thing you heard from Mr. Browning is, everybody on that website knew how to use it, knew how to get on it. You had to. And the way you did it was going through Tor. And that way nobody could see where you were. You couldn't see where it was. That was what they were all looking for, anonymity.

But somehow, some of those posts coming from PlayPen were not anonymous the same way. Somebody was doing something different.

Show me Defense 1 and 6. Zoom in on the text on the top.

Once again I'm showing you a Russian post here. I need you to pay attention for a minute to the exact date and time: August 25th, 5:34 a.m. at that time. Now down at the bottom what you're seeing is a log. And that is where the server itself, the website kept track of every time somebody logged on. What you're looking at there, you looked at it a couple days ago, is a log of every time somebody logged in using the PlayPen username and password.

And if you can blow up that one date, you can kill the top one.

What you're going to see highlighted there -- actually, first show me the date and time of that post.

If you look over on the left of that blow-up there, August 25, 2014, 5:34:24. So what you're seeing there is, on the top you are seeing the actual post, that PlayPen posting in the Russian language. And on the bottom you're seeing the server recording where that came from. It's not blank. That's not somebody logging in through Tor. That's somebody logging in through or from a computer in Chicago, Illinois.

Any data about Mr. Chase ever being in Chicago,
Illinois, before or going there or Facebook posts? They got
his Facebook account. Anything to indicate he's ever been
there? Or was there anywhere around that time? No.

Now Agent Alfin told you that you could speculate that, well, you know, that's probably a VPN company that might or might not keep records. But I didn't feel like it was worth it to just pick up the phone and ask them, You have a record?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Some of you all work from home on computers. talked about that a little bit when you were being questioned on Tuesday. And some of you use VPNs. And that means you have to have your own username and password, sometimes it's something your company sets up. And that's something that that's a service that your company purchases, I guess, from one of these computer companies. Somebody pays for that. Remember, that's how they went to all the trouble to find this PayPal account connected to Mr. Chase. All they had to do was make a phone call to the company in Chicago, Illinois. got the IP address. And actually when we zoom back out you'll see it. You can look at it in fact if you like. But that also shows them the IP address that gave them that location of Chicago, Illinois. So it's not just that that's recording that that's somewhere in the Chicago area. They have an IP That's a computer. It belongs to somebody that address. happens to be somewhere in the Chicago, Illinois, area. couple phone calls, a couple Google searches and you can find out whose computer that is. They chose not to do that. We don't know whose that is.

Now, you can see that whoever was logging in and making that Russian post was logging in a particular way that shows you a location. And you might -- that might rung a little bell with you because you said to yourself, I thought the whole point of this website, this Dark Web stuff, is that nobody knows where you are. So how is it that the server is finding that computer in Chicago, Illinois? The answer is, somebody's doing something differently. Because the people who normally use the site, people who normally log in, there's no trace of it.

Can you kill the blow-up and let's go back to the data? Okay. Kill both of the blow-ups.

You'll see on that log, I guess it's a little hard to see the dates. But you can see that some of those log-ins - why don't you just blow up all the -- blow up the locations. Yeah. Thank you.

You can see there are some in Chicago, Illinois, there's some in Miami, some in Ashburn, and then there are some that are blank. That is, some people logged in and the server couldn't figure out where they were, didn't know anything. That's people logging in the way Mr. Browning logged in. The way anybody knew what they were doing knew how to log in to leave no trace. And you can see somebody who's logging into that site using the PlayPen account knows what they're doing and is leaving no trace.

On that sheet I see one, two, three, four, five times that was done. And then a bunch of times where people are logging in some different way that's giving away where they are. Or maybe they're trying to show where they are. Maybe they're going through some sort of sites and some VPN to try to throw somebody off and make it look like it's somebody else doing it. Maybe it's somebody who was trying to pin it on someone else and doesn't know how to do it right.

Now, we talked -- when we were talking back and forth on Tuesday about how important it is to consider each charge individually -- and this is not going to be easy stuff. The charges are complicated, there's charges that are sort of within other charges. And I'm not going to try to go through every piece of evidence.

What I'm going to give you that I really ask you to pay attention to is certain little points or questions about each count that you need to ask, and they need to be answered.

And one thing I'm going to say that I really want you to keep in mind or look for is pay attention to the dates on those charges because the dates make a difference. The dates don't just give you clues about the fact that it's not Mr. Chase making those posts or committing those particular crimes that are charged, but also that that makes a difference as to what it gets used for when you look at other counts. That's where it gets a little complicated.

So I want to go through the counts, just a little bit on each, and just give you some things to look at and think about.

I'll start with Count Seven, the possession of child pornography. Like I said, the Government got up here and said I'm going to try to say that somebody put that in his computer, that didn't happen. That is what it is. You saw the evidence. I'm going to leave that count to your good judgment and move on.

But I differ with them a lot on Count Three which is the advertising count.

The Judge is going to tell you the definition of advertising. Like all legal definitions it's a little confusing. But the Judge is also going to tell you, you do not leave your common sense behind coming to court. You can use the common sense that you use every day. And I encourage you to use it even more when it's a matter of this seriousness.

If I ask you, Hey, do you want to buy my car? Did I just make an advertisement? No. An advertisement is something that you want to spread far and wide that you want to get people to know about because you're trying to get something or give something or whatever it is you're trying to do. But that's the essence of what it is. It's public.

If I, let's say I'm in -- I don't know if any of you

are in car clubs. I know there are a bunch around. I'm not right now. But let's say you go to guys in your car club and say, Look, I really need some money. I want to get rid of my car but I like it. I know you guys would take care of it. If one of you wants to buy it, that's fine. Don't tell anybody else. I'm a little hard up for cash or, you know, it's not my car anymore. So just keep it to yourself. Is that an advertisement? On the other hand if you say to them, Look, I'm trying to get rid of this car, if you know anybody interested, let them know. Those are two different things. One is an advertisement, one's not. An advertisement is trying to get the word out.

What do we know about this website that they're saying is advertising?

Can you give me Government's 2?

They showed you this same one, the front pages of the website. There's a part they didn't want you to pay attention to: "The Rules, spam flooding, advertisements, chain letters, pyramid schemes, and solicitations are forbidden on this forum."

Well, they didn't think they were advertising.

They're trying not to. In fact, I'm just -- just to boil it down I'll put it this way: Imagine this trial was over, you all have seen and heard an enormous amount of things that you never seen before and you've been forbidden from talking about

it with anybody. But there will come a time pretty soon when you can talk about it to other people. And, you know, somebody may ask you, Well, what was your jury service like? What was the case about?

You say, Well, it was about child pornography on the internet on a website. And they're probably going to say, Oh, my God, that is horrible. People just put that out on the internet where anybody could get it? Where children can see it? What are they doing, advertising it?

Are you going to say, Yeah, they were advertising for the whole world? No, you're going to say, Well, actually they were trying to keep it a secret on the Dark Web. You can only get to it if you didn't reveal anything about it. You should see what the FBI had to go through to try to crack it.

If you're trying to keep it a secret it's not advertisement, folks. So I want you to keep that in mind when you look at Count Three.

Count Two, to go backwards a little bit, I think is even easier. Because Count Two is a conspiracy to advertise. So what the Government is saying is that people got together and agreed with each other to advertise child pornography. Well, a lot of times people agree on things they do it in secret, as this website is supposed to be secret, and so you never hear what the words actually were of this agreement.

Well, you just saw it. That was the agreement. No

advertising allowed. I just read it.

All right. Counts Four, Five and Six are particular posts. And what that means is, those are particular dates, particular times, particular things that somebody using the PlayPen account did, posted on the website. And we have records of that.

Can you give me Government's 7? I'm sorry, not Government's 7, Defense 7.

Now the Government was just telling you that there were posts on particular dates and those are the crimes the actual individual -- particular crimes that they say Mr. Chase committed logged on to the PlayPen account. What they didn't tell you was: Do we have any data from that same server about where they came from?

Can you scroll down to September 26, 2014? I'm not sure which page that is. And if you could just zoom that.

Now what you're seeing is posts from around that date.

That's fine. That's fine.

What you're seeing is that some person or persons logged on to the PlayPen account on certain dates and times right around that same date. One of them on the 25th is going to be one of those posts or one of the counts that the Government is talking about. What you're seeing there is there is no data about where that came from; hidden.

Whoever or how ever many people are logging on using that account in those couple of days, they're doing it the way everybody else does on the site. The way Mr. Browning told you about. They're going through Tor and they are hiding where they are. The server can't see them. They can't see the server. You can see that because all the location data is blank.

Now let's look at October 12th, 2014. You can kill that blow up.

Now, this is one of those other counts, I believe it's Count Five, that they're saying that post, what you're seeing on your screen, October 12, 2014, 22:51:01 bulletin board post.

Now, what you can see above that outside the blow-up is for days and days before and after the person or persons using that account are doing it the way everybody knows to do it. Go through Tor, they can't see you and you can't see them. But on that date somebody decides to log-in from a computer in the Netherlands. Is that somebody's computer? Is it a person in the Netherlands? Is it a VPN company in the Netherlands?

I mean, I guess what the Government is going to say is, you know, if it's some sort of company, well, that could be anybody. And it could be Mr. Chase or you should assume it's Mr. Chase.

Well, you just saw all kinds of locations. We're talking about earlier, all kinds of companies. Why is one person paying VPN companies all over the world to log-in to something where anybody can log-in just use the free Tor browser that you talked about that's easy to use, apparently, as any of your regular internet browsers and there's no trace of that.

Somebody is doing that on purpose and it is not -Mr. Chase has never been to the Netherlands. He has no -there's no evidence of him ever searching anything or doing
anything in Dutch on his computer. You heard the Government
keeps pretty good records of people coming in and out of the
United States. Anytime you get on a plane or boat leaving
this country or coming in, Department of Homeland Security is
checking on you. There is no evidence he ever went there.

And this is my point, and this is why I felt it so important that we talk about this when we talked about it on Tuesday is, it is very easy to say: You know what? He had all that stuff in his house, he was working on it. I'm really not concerned so much with what he actually did or didn't do. He's just guilty.

I understand that human temptation because this is a complicated case. You've been asked to do a lot of work.

What you've been through, frankly, in the last three days, I wouldn't want to put most people through what you have to do.

But the job is not done. The hard part is just beginning where you actually have to sit and say, Let's look at that crime on that date. Is it something he committed or is it just possible that somebody used the same kind of hacking tool the FBI used and got into his computer and got out with just all they needed to get was a username and a password and it would leave no trace on this computer. And isn't it possible when you see people logging in from computers all over the country and all over the world that it was somebody else?

One of the reasons that each individual count is important, not just for what you see and what was done, but also where you go from there in terms of your verdict is Count One, which is the enterprise count. It's the first thing on the sheet. But when you're considering that you actually have to consider the other counts to sort of get to that.

And I was a little surprised, frankly, when the Government spent a lot of time just now going through all the elements of that offense and all the things you have to find, they left out the biggest one. Or for me I think what is the most important and at least it's an element you have to deal with it, and I think it's critical. Which is that these were crimes committed on separate incidents.

Even if you find that Mr. Chase committed some of those acts, that he distributed on a particular date, that the

particular post was his. If you end up finding that he somehow advertised or whatever it is, that last -- well, the first count, Count One says that if it's someone who's committed three of those other crimes, and they were child victims, which is obvious.

2.

And if it was more than one child, which is obvious, but they have to have been committed on separate dates, "separate incidents" is what the law says.

And what you're going to see is the advertising counts are all one big count covering the whole thing. The possession count is one count covering all the months of the conspiracy. Those obviously didn't happen at different times. They're not different incidents if they're all happening at the same time.

So that's just the way it's charged. And the Judge is going to tell you that you are not to consider any acts or anything that are outside the indictment. You have to address each count particularly. And what that means is what you're left with is, what's on separate incidents? What separate dates? And it's those three. That's what it comes down to. Those three dates I just showed you with the two blank entries and the one in the middle.

You know, I can't tell you how to make your decision. It's all about whether the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt. And what that ends up meaning, the

Judge is going to tell you the words say what they mean. But I just want to put one thing up that I want to leave you with here.

Can you show me our Exhibit 8 and 7?

When you're considering those three counts and whether the Government has proven that those were Mr. Chase and not a hacker -- actually just show me 8, first. Just give me 8 on the whole screen. Can you zoom in on that? Yeah, scroll through just a little bit.

What you're seeing here is Mr. Browning's log, or what we know as Stretch Armstrong. This is every time that Stretch Armstrong logged into the server. And part of the log that the server kept is where he was. And what you see is every entry is exactly the same. You got that 127.0.0.1. We discussed what that means is basically like a blank. It's not an actual place. And there's more.

That's all right. You can stop.

That is the log of someone who is an active user, who is participating in the website, and who knows how to do it, and gets on the way everyone else does, leaving no trace. That's what that looks like. And Mr. Browning told you how he did it. That's how he did it every time. No reason to do it any other way where that gives you the maximum privacy, the maximum chance that somebody like the Government seeing that server, they can't find you. They have no location to find

you.

Now show me the other one, 7.

This is the log of the PlayPen account. This is the log of the mastermind that the Government tells you is running the whole show, the puppet master behind the whole thing.

Like the Wizard said in the Wizard of Oz, "Pay no attention to the man behind the curtain."

As it turns out, it looks like there's a bunch of people behind the curtain. This is someone they claim set the whole thing up for maximum privacy and knew how to do it just like everybody else did so there will never be a trace left of where he was. And yet, there are traces all over.

Give me the next page. Stop just with the next page.

See what you see here? Where is that? Texas,
Florida, Chicago, back and forth between all of them and
interspersed between them and down at the bottom are blanks.
So somebody knew how to do this right. Every time you see a
blank, that's somebody who knows how to get on and off this
website without leaving a trace.

Are those other people really in those places? Or are those people who either don't know how to do it right or are trying to deflect the blame on to somebody else?

Whatever it is, they're not trying to do what any administrator or even just regular user of that website knows

how to do.

2 You can kill it.

Bottom line is this, folks, when we talk about three posts with those three dates there's no proof that Mr. Chase did it. I can't sit here and prove he didn't. The law doesn't require it.

That's when the Judge told you about the importance of reasonable doubt in our criminal justice system. What it boils down to is this: We know it's hard, sometimes impossible for an innocent person to prove that he's innocent. And so we don't make him do that. We say, You are the Government. You are investigating these cases. You are accusing one of our fellow citizens of one of these crimes. It's up to you to prove it.

If you can't, if there's any doubt left in your mind and, you know, if a post from the Netherlands from somebody who should know better doesn't tell you there's something else going on, if posts about -- if posts from people who don't even speak English all that well -- show me Defense 2.

This is one of the other posts that the Government didn't want you to pay much attention to. That's somebody using the PlayPen account saying, "I only speak English.

These personal posts make me nervous because I can't read them."

Remember, people were particular. Mr. Browning told

you just because these people are into their particular fetishes doesn't mean all bets are off, I think is what he said. And somebody in PlayPen is nervous because he only speaks English. I suppose the Government is going to say that proves that's Mr. Chase because he speaks English and only English.

Now show me Defense 3, and show me -- actually, show me again part 2 and then part 3.

Here's another post from PlayPen. The pink part is what somebody else is posting, whatever the chat was. And I think I eluded to this with the witness. It turns out, you know, some of us are sticklers for grammar, some aren't. Turns out even sticklers for grammar even turn up on websites like this. And somebody is complaining about the difference between your and you're and two, to, and too. And PlayPen gets irritated and replies.

I'm sorry. Can you just go over the reply again.

"Sorry, Ms. Perfect, English is not my or any of us first language. More time loving, less time pointing your finger, please."

Remember, this is in the one place where these folks feel comfortable talking to each other about it and how they feel about things. And that's somebody getting irritated because, you know, they're struggling with English and that's the best they can do. Is that Mr. Chase? Who? No evidence

that he's been involved in any other language or knows any other language.

When you're looking at these posts and you're deciding whether a particular post is something that he did or could have been done by somebody else, I think you have to keep in mind what the Judge is going to tell you that we can not prove when somebody is innocent. The Government has to prove they're guilty; bottom line.

In this case, other than Count Seven, I'm going to leave that alone.

But go through the points that I told you. And what I encourage you to do is take the time you need. You'll have those exhibits, this post, or anything else up there available to you to look at. Check the dates.

What I want you to do is go back there and I know you can do the job you've sworn an oath to do. We knew it was hard. And a lot of folks got out of jury duty this week because they couldn't do it and you're the ones that can. So I'm asking you to go back there and as to the things the Government has not proved that he did, which is most of it, frankly, I want you to find him not guilty. Thank you.

MR. JONES: In my opening statement I told you that this was a very simple and a very straightforward case.

However, it was a very disturbing and a very troubling case, and I believe you've seen that throughout the course of this

trial.

I also told you that the defendant would attempt to confuse you, or attempt to try a case different than the one charged in the indictment. This is exactly what defense counsel has done. He's -- his entire closing argument is an attempt to confuse. All of the evidence in this case, ladies and gentlemen, has pointed to the defendant. Defense counsel talks, makes a statement, his opening statement and argument, that people lie and people use the internet to commit crimes. And he's exactly right.

This Defendant, Steven Chase, used the internet to engage in a child exploitation enterprise by working together -- a website, a child pornography website with over 100,000 members dedicated to the sexual abuse of children on line. Children that you saw were as young as toddlers. This defendant is guilty.

I'll start just briefly because defense counsel spent 20 minutes on his closing argument on one Russian post. Mr. Chase posted over 200 times on this website. He spent 20 minutes of his closing argument on one post. A post, as you heard Agent Alfin testify, that he could read easily. He said you could get on Google and translate that post easily. The purpose of the Tor -- of the Dark Web was to remain anonymous, ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

Further, the defense makes a point that: Hey

somebody hacked his account and created that Russian post. As he testified -- Agent Alfin testified again that there has been no indication that the account was hacked. The pin trap and tracing speaks it. The pin track and trace indicates that someone in his mom's home in Maine, and at his home in Naples, Florida, was using Tor web, the Dark Web, at the same time the PlayPen user account was logged into on the PlayPen website.

It doesn't make sense, ladies and gentlemen of jury.

Reasonable doubt, reason and common sense, that's all it is.

It just doesn't make sense.

And just briefly he talked also about the advertisement, the registration agreement saying no advertisement.

My co-counsel explained advertisement to you very straightforward and very simple for you. Advertisement is simply published to see with the intent to attract others to that subject matter.

Mr. Chase posted on this child pornography website, "Web Cam Three Girls," a thread he created with three females exposing their genitals. That's an advertisement, ladies and gentlemen. It attracted people to it. As a matter of fact, it attracted over -- it was read over 8,000 times. That's clearly an advertisement, ladies and gentlemen.

Defense also makes a statement that the Government traced the payment and went into his house and the case is

over. That's just not the case. All of the evidence in this case points to the defendant. Just look at another exhibit my co-counsel stated, starting with the CentriLogic exhibit.

Which tracing back to the server hosting account, it was traced back to his mom's house in Maine during the time he was there. The Time Warner address being logged into. The Comcast to his house. The Yahoo email, Mike Taylor, all of the accounts logged onto his computer. They all point back to the defendant. Nobody else but the defendant in this case, ladies and gentlemen. As I told you, it's a simple and straightforward case. Nobody but the defendant was the user PlayPen on this account.

And he also failed to mention after they conducted all of this analysis, CentriLogic, Time Warner, Comcast, Yahoo, after all that led to Naples, Florida, on the night of February 19, 2015, they get in the house, he's logged in, not just into the PlayPen website but as the PlayPen username. But he still wants you to think that, Hey, my -- somebody's computer was hacked. It was somebody else. It doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense because it's not true.

Let's not forget the thumb drive that was connected to the laptop which contained the image poster for PlayPen website over 8,000 child exploitation images, passwords for the user account Mike Taylor all over the defendant's laptop, google searches for child pornography on Netflix.

Ladies and gentlemen, all of the evidence in this case points back to the Defendant Steven Chase in his engaging in a child exploitation enterprise, conspiring to advertise child pornography, advertising child pornography, transporting child pornography, and possessing child pornography. All those three transportation counts were posted by the username PlayPen and the username PlayPen was nobody but the Defendant Steven Chase.

As I close, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I just like for you to remember that the defendant created this website and ran it along with -- you saw the staff lists, moderators, global moderators that he helped choose. But for him there would not be this PlayPen website with over 100,000 members who were dedicated to the sexual abuse of children on line.

All of the evidence in this case, ladies and gentlemen, points to nobody else but the Defendant Steven Chase. He's guilty of engaging in a child exploitation enterprise, conspiracy to commit advertising, advertising, the three transportation counts, and the possession of child pornography, nobody but the defendant. The defendant and no one else was the username PlayPen on that child pornography website. Nobody else but him, ladies and gentlemen. So we ask that you find this Defendant, Steven Chase, guilty on all counts. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you all for your arguments.

Now, members of the jury, what we'll do is take a 15-minute break and then we will call for you to come back. I will give you the rest of the instructions and then you will be able to go to lunch and take up to maybe 45 minutes to an hour. But when you all come back, you will be able to just walk into the jury room, and as soon as all 12 of you are there you may start your deliberations. And I will be talking to the alternates about your role at that time. So that gives you the immediate schedule.

Let's take a break. Keep an open mind about the case. Don't discuss it at all. Remember all the instructions and keep an open mind and we'll have the rest of the instructions for you right after the break. Thank you.

(The jury was escorted from the courtroom.)

(Recess at 11:44 until 12:03.)

THE COURT: All right. Members of the jury, one quick note. You, of course, have seen our court reporter who has the hardest job in the courtroom. Who has taken a transcript of the case, but it's not final or confirmed and we haven't had a chance to review it or anything. And she always does a beautiful job of polishing it if we need a transcript. But you will not have a transcript of testimony available to you so you have to remember the evidence.

Now then, I'll read to you as we go through the

counts from the Bill of Indictment, the statutes under which the charges are laid and the essential elements of the offenses. And the elements are important because they break down the offense to the specific items the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt before there could be a conviction on a given count.

Now, as I think I may have told you before, you will have copy of the indictment with you in the jury room so it is not necessary for you to try to memorize exactly how the charges are laid.

Also, please be patient in listening to these instructions as your understanding of the charges against the defendant will not be complete until you heard all of them described, including the definitions that I will give you about certain words and phrases.

I also note that the verdict sheet, which the clerk will hand to you as you begin your deliberations, will contain in some notations indicating how to move from one count to another in making your decisions. So that should be self-explanatory so I won't discuss that in these instructions.

Now, in Count One, which I will now read to you. As I remind you, the counts in the indictment are not evidence. They're merely accusations.

Count One alleges that between on or about

August 19, 2014, and March 4, 2015, in Caldwell County, within the Western District of North Carolina and elsewhere, Steven W. Chase, Michael Fluckiger, David Lynn Browning did knowingly engage in a child exploitation enterprise, that is, Steven W. Chase, Michael Fluckiger and David Lynn Browning violated Chapter 110 of Title 18 of the United States Code, as a part of a series of felony violations constituting three or more separate incidents and involving more than one minor victim, which offenses include those described in Counts Three through Seven of this indictment, for your purposes, and committed those offenses in concert with three or more persons.

This is alleged in violation of Title 18, Section 2252A(g).

Now in this Count One defendant is charged, as I say, under Section 2252A(g). As you will hear, a conviction, if any, under this statute will involve your findings and consideration as to Counts Three through Seven of the Bill of Indictment. But before I discuss those counts, I shall describe Count One simply because it comes first in the Bill of Indictment.

A person under this statute as it reads -- "A person engages in a child exploitation enterprise for the purposes of this section if the person violates sections within Chapter 110, as a part of a series of felony violations constituting three or more separate incidents and involving one or more

victim, and commits those offenses in concert with three or more persons."

Now such alleged underlying felony violations will be referred to within these instructions as predicate offenses.

So you have the charge which is Count One. You have the predicate offenses which are alleged later on in the indictment.

Now, in support of the Count One charge under that Section 2252A(g), the Government alleges, as I said, three predicate offenses found in Chapter 110 as charged in Counts Three through Seven of the Bill of Indictment. Namely, that Steven W. Chase, violated Title 18, Sections 2251(d), 2252A(a)(1), and 2252A(a)(5)(B).

The first of these predicate offenses is found in Chapter 110 -- or as found in Chapter 110 is the advertising charge which comes under Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 2251(d). And that charge makes it a violation as follows:

Any person who, in circumstances described in paragraph 2 below, knowingly makes, prints, or publishes, or causes to be made, printed, or published, any notice or advertisement seeking or offering to receive, exchange, buy, produce, display, distribute, or reproduce, any visual depiction, if the production of such visual depiction involves the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct and

such visual depiction is of such conduct.

Secondly, this is paragraph two. The circumstance, rather, referred to in paragraph 1 is that:

- A. Such person knows or has reason to know that such notice or advertisement will be transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means including by computer; or
- B. Such notice or advertisement is transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means including by computer.

Now, the second of these predicate offenses described in Chapter 110 is the transportation charge and it sets forth the following law:

An individual violates Section 2252A(a)(1) if he knowingly transports or ships using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means, including by computer, any child pornography.

And, finally, the third such predicate offense described in Chapter 110, that would be the possession of child pornography charge is as follows:

An individual violates Section 2252A(a)(5)(B), if he knowingly possesses, or knowingly accesses with intent to

view, any film, videotape, computer disk, or any other material that contains an image of child pornography that has been mailed, or shipped or transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means, including by computer, or that was produced using materials that have been mailed, shipped or transported in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means, including by computer.

When I instruct you on Counts Three through Seven of the Bill of Indictment I will instruct you as to the elements of each of these alleged predicate offenses, as well as the relevant definitions of terms used within those alleged predicate offenses.

Of course, I refer to the charges in Counts Three through Seven of the Indictment as predicate offenses for purposes of the child exploitation -- or, rather, for the enterprise of child exploitation, but they also stand on their own as to Counts Three through Seven, and you address each count in this Bill of Indictment separately, and consider the evidence that pertains to each count separately. And issue your verdict as to each count accordingly. Even though as you have heard, there are some relationships between some of the counts.

Now then, so let's look at the essential elements of Count One. This is how those elements break down the statute.

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense charged in Count One, the Government must establish each of the following essential elements:

First, that defendant committed at least three separate predicate offenses that comprise a series of at least three instances; and

Secondly, the series of at least three instances involve more than one victim who was a minor; and

Third, the defendant committed the series of at least three instances in concert with three or more persons.

I will now define certain elements used in these essential elements. You are to apply these definitions as you consider the evidence. And if I don't define certain words, you would assign to them their ordinary, everyday meanings. Again, I'll provide you with the essential elements of each specifically alleged predicate offense, along with the relevant definitions to those offenses and elements, when I instruct you on Counts Three through Seven.

You'll note that the Bill of Indictment with respect to each offense charged, charges the offense or offenses were committed "on or about" a certain date or dates. The proof need not establish with certainty the exact date of an alleged offense. It is sufficient if the evidence in the case establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the offense in question was committed on a date reasonably near the date or

dates alleged in the indictment.

Now, a "predicate offense" is a separate and additional offense underlying the offense charged in Count One that the Government must establish the defendant committed through proof beyond a reasonable doubt. For purposes of Count One, the Government must prove that the defendant committed three or more predicate offenses.

The offenses you may consider in determining whether defendant committed three or more predicate offenses are found in Chapter 110. And included in that, as I've already gone over to some extent, you have offenses for Advertising Child Pornography under Section 2251(d) as charged in Count Three; and next, Transporting or Shipping Child Pornography in violation of Section 2252A(a(1), and as charged in Counts Four, Five and Six; and lastly, Possession of Child Pornography in violation of Title 18, 2252A(a)(5)(b), and that is charged in Count Seven.

Furthermore, at least three of the predicate offenses must be separate from one another, in that each predicate offense must arise out of a different event entirely from the other predicate offenses.

Accordingly, you may rely on multiple violations of the same statutory section within Chapter 110 to reach a total of three predicate offenses so long as each violation of the statute is separate from the other violations. Before you may

return a verdict of guilty as to Count One, you must unanimously agree upon which three, or more, predicate offenses the defendant committed, if any. And if you are unable to unanimously agree upon which three, or more, predicate offenses the defendant committed, then you must return a verdict of not guilty even if you unanimously agree that defendant committed a total of three, or more, predicate offenses.

Finally, if you return a verdict of guilty on Count One, the verdict form will ask you to identify which of the alleged predicate offenses the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt, if any.

Now then, a "minor" is any person under the age of 18 years.

Now I'll define the words and phrase "in concert with three or more persons."

To find that the defendant acted "in concert with three or more persons," you must unanimously agree that the Government presented proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant agreed with three or more persons, himself included, to commit the required series of predicate offenses. In other words, the defendant and the individuals he allegedly acted in concert with must have had an actual meeting of the minds regarding the commission of the predicate offenses. In this respect, the mental requirement for finding the defendant

acted "in concert" with three or more persons is the same as the mental requirement for finding that defendant entered into a criminal conspiracy with three or more persons.

Excuse me one moment.

I'm going to correct myself in terms of the requirement that the Government show defendant acted "in concert" with others.

The actual phrase in the statute is that "he would have to have acted in concert with three or more other persons." So the three persons he acted in concert with, if any, would not include him.

Now then, going on to define this word -- this phrase "in concert with three or more persons" that is the mental element.

A criminal conspiracy is an agreement or a mutual understanding knowingly made and knowingly entered into by multiple people to violate the law through some joint plan or common course of action. A conspiracy or agreement to violate the law, like many other kinds of agreements or understandings, need not be formal, written, or even expressed directly in every detail.

And, again, this concerns whether the defendant acted in concert with three or more others.

To prove the existence of an illegal agreement, the Government is not required to produce evidence of a contract

or other agreement explicitly detailing all facets of the understanding. Moreover, to prove a conspiracy or agreement, the Government is not required to show that all the identified members of the conspiracy or agreement were, in fact, parties to the original agreement or that all of the members of the agreement to all of the means and methods of accomplishing the goal of the agreement.

Instead, the Government must prove that the defendant and at least three other persons, whether the other persons are also defendants or not, knowingly and deliberately arrived at some type of agreement or understanding that they, and perhaps others, would violate the law by some means of a common plan or course of action as set forth in the Bill of Indictment. It is proof of this conscious understanding and deliberate agreement by the alleged member of the -- members of the enterprise that should be central to your consideration of this Count One charge.

Furthermore, the Government does not have to demonstrate that defendant acted in concert with three or more people to commit each of the predicate offenses composing this series of instances. Instead, the Government need only demonstrate that defendant acted in concert with three or more other people over the course of the entire series of instances. To conceptualize this, if you find that defendant acted in concert with only one other person when committing

each of the three predicate offenses but that defendant acted in concert with a different individual when committing each of the predicate offenses, then defendant would have acted in concert with three people over the series of instances.

The Government must show beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed each of the three, or more, predicate offenses knowingly. And that is the mental element of the offense.

The word "knowingly," as used in these instructions to describe the alleged state of mind of the defendant, means that he was conscious and aware of his actions, realized what he was doing or what was happening around him, and did not act because of ignorance, mistake or accident. Knowledge may be proven by a defendant's conduct, and by all of the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

The purpose of adding the element "knowingly" is to insure that no one will be convicted due to mistake or, accident, or other innocent reason.

So summing up on Count One, I charge you that if you find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that on or about the date or dates alleged, within the Western District of North Carolina, that:

1. Defendant committed at least three separate predicate offenses that comprise a series of at least three instances; and

- 2. That the series was -- excuse me, a series of at least three instances involved more than one victim who was a minor; and
- 3. That defendant committed the series of at least three instances in concert with three or more other persons, then it would be your duty to return a verdict of guilty -- of guilty as charged in Count One. And, however, if you do not so find, if you have a reasonable doubt as to one or more of the essential elements of the crime charged, then it would be your duty to give him the benefit of that doubt and return a verdict of not guilty on Count One.

Defendant is charged under Section 2251(d) and (e).

I will move to Count Two.

Subsection (d) describes the offense of Advertising Child Pornography. While subsection (e) makes it a crime to conspire to commit the offense of Advertising Child Pornography. This part of the instructions deals with the conspiracy charge in Count two, that's the conspiracy to commit the advertising offense. And you will consider that separately from Count Three when I get to it, which is the standalone offense of Advertising Child Pornography. We also call that a substantive offense, whereas the one I'm about to go into is Count Two, the conspiracy offense. You see there's

You will be looking at Count Three a little bit

obviously a relationship there.

later and that is the substantive count of Advertising Child Pornography. But that has its own instructions that pertain to it, and so does this charge of Conspiracy to Advertise Child Pornography which I will now give to you.

Now Count Two reads as follows:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Between, on or about August 19, 2014, and March 4, 2015, in Caldwell County, within the Western District of North Carolina and elsewhere, Steven W. Chase, Michael Fluckiger, and David Lynn Browning did knowingly conspire to make, print, publish, and cause to be made, printed, and published, any notice or advertisement seeking and offering to receive, exchange, buy, produce, display, distribute, and reproduce, any visual depiction, the production of which visual depiction involved the use of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct and such visual depiction was of such conduct; and participation in any act of sexually explicit conduct by and with any minor for the purpose of producing a visual depiction of such conduct; knowing and having reason to know that such notice and advertisement would be transported using any means and facility of interstate and foreign commerce and in and affecting interstate and foreign commerce by any means, including by computer, and such notice and advertisement was transported using any means and facility of interstate and foreign commerce and in and affecting interstate and foreign commerce by any means including computer.

Now then, I'm going to read to you the offense that is alleged in Count Two to be the object of the conspiracy alleged in Count Two. And as you heard before, this is Section 2251(d), and it will sound familiar because that's the offense. It alleges, that is to say, the statute reads as follows:

Any person who, in a circumstance described in paragraph 2, knowingly makes, prints, or publishes, or causes to be made, printed, or published, any notice or advertisement seeking or offering to receive, exchange, buy, produce, display, distribute, or reproduce, any visual depiction, if the production of such visual depiction involves the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct, and with such visual depiction -- or, rather, such depiction is of such conduct, or that participation in any act of sexually explicit conduct by or with any minor for the purpose of producing a visual depiction of such conduct.

Now, the circumstance referred to in paragraph 2 comes under the following language:

The circumstance referred to is that:

A. Such person knows or has reason to know that such notice or advertisement will be transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means including by computer; or

Such notice or advertisement is transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means including by computer.

So as I explained earlier, Section 2251 makes it a crime for an individual to conspire to commit the offense described in subsection (d).

Subsection (d) will be the subject of Count Three standing alone, and I'll get to that a little bit later.

But here we are with the essential elements of Count
Two, a Conspiracy to Advertise Child Pornography.

These are the essential elements:

For you to find him guilty of the offense charged in Count Two the Government must establish each of the following essential elements:

On or within the dates alleged, and within the Western District of North Carolina, and elsewhere:

First, that the conspiracy described in the Bill of Indictment was an agreement or understanding between two or more persons, that the conspiracy was willfully formed, and that it was existing at the time alleged in the Bill of Indictment;

Secondly, that at some time during the existence or life of the conspiracy, the defendant knew the purpose of the agreement or understanding and willfully joined the

conspiracy; and

Lastly, that the object of the conspiracy was to Advertise Child Pornography, in violation of 18 U.S. Code 2251(d).

You will use the same definitions I gave you earlier to define "minor" and "knowingly."

I'll now give you additional definitions pertinent to the conspiracy aspect of the charge in Count Two. I'll give you definitions relevant to the object of the conspiracy, the offense of Advertising Child Pornography, when instructing you on Count Three.

A criminal conspiracy is an agreement or a mutual understanding knowingly made or knowingly entered into by at least two people to violate the law by some joint or common plan or course of action. A conspiracy is, in a very true sense, a partnership in crime.

A conspiracy or agreement to violate the law, like any other kind of agreement or understanding, need not be formal, written, or even expressed directly in every detail.

To prove the existence of a conspiracy or an illegal agreement, the Government is not required to produce a written contract between the parties or even produce evidence of an express oral agreement spelling out all the details of the understanding. Moreover, to prove that a conspiracy existed, the Government is not required to show that all of the people

named in the indictment as members of the conspiracy, in fact, were parties to the original agreement, or that all of the members of the alleged conspiracy were named or charged, or that all of the people whom the evidence shows were actually members of a conspiracy agreed to all of the means or methods set out in the indictment.

Instead, the Government must prove that the defendant and at least one other person knowingly and deliberately arrived at an agreement or understanding that they, and perhaps others, would violate the law by means of some common plan or course of action as alleged in Count Two. In other words, unlike in Count One where the Government needed to prove the defendant agreed with three, or more, people to commit the series of three instances, proof that defendant agreed with at least one other person to violate Section 2251(d), the advertising offense, is sufficient for purposes of Count Two. It is proof of this conscious understanding and deliberate agreement by the alleged members that should be central to your consideration of the charge of conspiracy.

Unless the Government proves beyond a reasonable doubt that a conspiracy, as just explained, actually existed, then you must acquit defendant of the charge in Count Two.

Now then, as to membership in the agreement. If you should conclude that the conspiracy did exist as alleged, you

should next determine whether defendant knowingly and willfully became a member of the conspiracy. That is, whether the defendant in question knowingly and willfully became a member. Before the jury may find that the defendant, or any other person, became a member of the conspiracy charged in Count Two, the evidence in the case must show beyond a reasonable doubt that defendant knew the purpose or goal of the agreement or understanding and deliberately entered into the agreement intending, in some way, to accomplish the goal or purpose of this common plan.

If the evidence establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that defendant knowingly and deliberately entered into an agreement to Advertise Child Pornography, the fact that defendant did not join the beginning -- joined the agreement, rather, at its beginning, or did not know all of the details of the agreement, or did not play a major role in accomplishing the unlawful goal is not important to your decision regarding membership in the conspiracy.

On the other hand, certain things do not, taken alone, make someone a member of a conspiracy. Merely associating with others and discussing common goals, mere similarity of conduct between or among such persons, merely being present at the place where the crime took place or is discussed, or even knowing about criminal conduct does not, by itself, make someone a member of a conspiracy.

Now, concerning the object of the conspiracy. If
you concluded that the conspiracy did exist as alleged, and
that the defendant in question knowingly became a member of
it, then you should next determine whether or not an objective
or goal of the alleged conspiracy was to Advertise Child

Now, ultimately, the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a conspiracy was willfully formed and had as its purpose the Advertising of Child Pornography. You should make your determination as to the purpose of a conspiracy from all the evidence presented. Keep in mind there may be a conviction as to this conspiracy count even though the conspirators may not have succeeded in accomplishing their common object or purpose in some way or ways and, in fact, failed in accomplishing it.

So then, reiterating the essential elements. If you find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that on or about the date or dates alleged, within the Western District of North Carolina and elsewhere:

First, that the conspiracy described in the Bill of Indictment, Count Two, was an agreement or understanding between two or more persons, that the conspiracy was willfully formed, and that it was existing at the time alleged in the Bill of Indictment; and

Second, that at some time during the existence or

Pornography as alleged.

life of the conspiracy, the defendant knew the purpose of the agreement and understandingly and willfully joined it; and

Advertise Child Pornography, in violation of 18 U.S. Code 2251(d) and (e), then it would be your duty to return a verdict of guilty as charged in Count Two. However, if you do not so find, or if you have a reasonable doubt as to one or more of the essential elements of the crime charged, as I have just given them to you, then it would be your duty to give the defendant the benefit of that doubt and return a verdict of not guilty on Count Two.

Now then, in Count Three, the Defendant, Steven W. Chase is charged with violating Title 18 Section 2251(d).

The pertinent part of this statute for purposes of this count are as follows:

1. Any person who, in a circumstance described in paragraph 2 below, knowingly makes, prints, or publishes, or causes to be made, printed, or published, any notice or advertisement seeking or offering:

To receive, exchange, buy, produce, display, distribute, or reproduce, any visual depiction, if the production of such visual depiction involves the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct and such visual depiction is of such conduct; and

2. The circumstance referred to in paragraph 1

would be that:

A. Such person knows or has reason to know that such notice or advertisement would be transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means including by computer; or

Such notice or advertisement is transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means including by computer.

So here is how the essential elements of this count break down.

The substantive or stand alone offense of Advertising Child Pornography.

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense charged in Count Three of the Bill of Indictment, the Government must establish each of the following essential elements:

First, that the defendant knowingly made, printed, published, or caused to be made, printed, or published, a notice or advertisement;

Second, the notice or advertisement sought or offered to receive, exchange, buy, produce, display, distribute, or reproduce a visual depiction; and

Third, the production of the visual depiction

involved the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct, and the visual depiction is of the sexually explicit conduct;

And the defendant knew that the person the advertisement sought or offered a visual depiction of was a minor; and

5(a), The defendant knew or had reason to know that the notice or advertisement would be transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce, including by a computer; or

(b), The notice or advertisement was transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce, including by computer.

As you recall I've already defined "minor" and "knowingly." I will give you other definitions pertinent to this offense which you should consider.

A notice or advertisement is a published or transmitted matter that makes a particular thing known. A notice or advertisement is made with the intention of attracting others to the subject matter of the notice or advertisement. Furthermore, in determining whether something is a notice or advertisement, you should consider the context in which the alleged notice or advertisement is made, printed, published, and/or disseminated, such that a printing or publication that implicitly offers or seeks out a visual

depiction of child pornography may qualify as a notice or advertisement.

Now the phrase "visual depiction" includes undeveloped film and videotape, data stored on a computer disk or by electronic means which is capable of conversion into a visual image, and data that is capable of conversion into a visual image that has been transmitted by any means, whether or not stored in a permanent format.

The term "sexually explicit conduct" means actual or simulated:

- a. Sexual intercourse, including genitalia-genitalia, oral-genitalia, anal-genitalia, oral-anal contact, whether between persons of the same or opposite sex;
 - b. Bestiality;

- c. Masturbation;
- d. Sadistic or masochistic abuse; or
- e. Lascivious exhibition of the genitals or pubic area of any person.

Now, regarding the last type of sexually explicit conduct, "lascivious exhibition," not every exposure of the genitals or pubic area constitutes a lascivious exhibition. In determining whether -- excuse me.

In determining whether a visual depiction constitutes a lascivious exhibition, you should consider the context and setting in which the genitalia or pubic area is

being displayed. You may consider the overall content of the material. You may also consider such facts as whether the focal point of the visual depiction is on the minor's genitalia or pubic area, or whether there is some other focal point. You may consider whether the setting of the depiction is such as to make it appear to be sexually inviting or suggestive; for example, in a location or in a pose associated with sexual activity. In addition, you may consider whether the minor appears to be displayed in an unnatural pose or in an appropriate -- or inappropriate attire. You may also consider whether the minor is partially clothed or nude. may consider whether the depiction appears to convey sexual coyness or an apparent willingness to engage in sexual activity, and whether the depiction appears to have been designed to elicit a sexual response in the viewer. A visual depiction need not involve all of these factors to be a lascivious exhibition. Excuse me a moment.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means the movement of property from one state to another state or from one state to another country. The term "State" for this purpose includes a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, and any Commonwealth, Territory, or possession of the United States. Proof that material moved over the internet is sufficient to demonstrate that the material traveled in interstate or foreign commerce. Finally, it is

not necessary for the Government to prove that defendant knew that the alleged child pornography had moved in interstate or foreign commerce, only that it had so moved.

The term "computer" means an electronic, magnetic, optical, electrochemical, or other high speed data processing device performing logical, arithmetic, or storage functions, and includes any data storage facility or communications facility directly related to or operating in conjunction with such device, but such term does not include an automated typewriter or typesetter, a portable hand-held calculator, or other similar device.

So breaking down Count Three again, and reiterating the essential elements, I charge you that if you find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that on or about the date or dates alleged and within the Western District of North Carolina or elsewhere:

Defendant knowingly made, printed, published, or caused to be made, printed, or published, a notice or advertisement;

Second, the notice or advertisement sought or offered to receive, exchange, buy, produce, display, distribute, or reproduce a visual depiction; and

3. The production of the visual depiction involved the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct, and the visual depiction is of the sexually explicit conduct; and

4. The defendant knew that the person the advertisement sought or offered a visual depiction of was a minor; and

5(a). That defendant knew or had reason to know that the notice or advertisement would be transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce, including by computer; or

B. The notice or advertisement was transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce, including by computer;

And if you find those to have been proven beyond a reasonable doubt, it would be your duty to return a verdict of guilty as charged in Count Three.

However, if you do not so find, or if you have reasonable doubt as to one or more of the essential elements of the crime charged, then it would be your duty to give defendant the benefit of the doubt and return a verdict of not guilty on Count Three.

Now we come to Counts Four, Five and Six which will be charged -- rather, instructed on at one sitting, you might say, because they all involve the same statute, the same alleged violation.

First I'll read to you the statute, that is to say, the indictment.

Count Four alleges that on or about February 1,

2015, in Caldwell County, within the Western District of North Carolina and elsewhere, Steven W. Chase knowingly transported and shipped, using any means and facility of interstate or foreign commerce, and in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means, including by computer, any child pornography as defined in Title 18 U.S. Code Section 2256(8)(A). All in violation of Title 18 U.S. Code Section 2252A(a)(1).

Now Count Five alleges exactly the same offense in the same words, except it alleges that it occurred on or about October 12, 2014.

And Count Six involves the same charge in the same wording except that it is alleged to have occurred on or about September 26, 2014.

So the dates then of Four, Five and Six would be February 1, 2015, October 12, 2014, and September 26, 2014, in Counts Four, Five and Six, sequentially. So that we'll instruct on those three counts all the instructions pertaining to each count individually, and you should apply the evidence individually as to each count according to the offense charged and the date alleged on which it is alleged to have occurred.

Now, the Section 2252A(a)(1) states:

Any person who knowingly transports or ships using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means,

including by computer, any child pornography shall be punished as provided in subsection b.

Now then, the essential elements then for these three offenses are the same.

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense charged in Count Four, Five or Six, considering the evidence separately as to each count, the Government must establish beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following essential elements:

First, that defendant knowingly transported or shipped material using any means or facility in interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means, including by computer;

Second, that the material is child pornography; and Third, that defendant knew that one or more persons depicted in the material was a minor.

Now then, you are to use the same definitions I gave you earlier for the word "minor, visual depiction, sexually explicit conduct, interstate or foreign commerce, computer and knowingly."

I'll now give you an additional definition which you should consider as to these three counts, Counts Four, Five and Six.

"Child pornography" means any visual depiction, including any photograph, film, video, picture, or computer,

or computer-generated image or picture, whether made or reproduced -- or produced by electronic, mechanical, or other means, of sexually explicit conduct, where the production of the visual depiction involves the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct.

So, members of the jury, reiterating the elements of this offense, which as I have said, applies to all Counts Four, Five and Six, independently.

First, that defendant on or about the date or dates alleged within the Western District of North Carolina or elsewhere:

Defendant knowingly transported or shipped material using any means or facility in interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means, including by computer; and

Second, that the material was child pornography;

Third, that the defendant knew that one or more

persons depicted in the material was a minor, then it would be

your duty to return a verdict of guilty as charged in Count

Four, Five and Six respectively. However, if you do not so

find as to either or any of these counts, or if you have a

reasonable doubt as to one or more of the essential elements

of the crime charged as it related to Counts Four, Five or

Six, then it would be your duty to give the defendant the

benefit of that doubt and return a verdict of not guilty as to

any or all of these counts according to how you find.

Now, the last count is Count Seven, Possession of Child Pornography.

In Count Seven the Defendant, Steven W. Chase, is charged with violating Title 18 U.S. Code Section 2252A(a)(5)(B).

And Count Seven reads as follows:

Again, it is not evidence.

It alleges that between, on or about August 19, 2014, and February 17, 2015, in Caldwell County, within the Western District of North Carolina, and elsewhere, Steven W. Chase knowingly possessed any film, videotape, computer disk, and any other material that contained an image of child pornography as described, or rather, defined in Title 18 Section 2256A(8) -- excuse me, (8)(A), that involved a minor who had not attained 12 years of age, and that has been mailed, and shipped, and transported using any means and facility of interstate and foreign commerce, and in and affecting interstate and foreign commerce by any means, including by computer, and that was produced using materials that have been mailed, shipped, and transported in and affecting interstate and foreign commerce by any means including by computer.

All in violation of 18 U.S. Code 2252A(a)(5)(B).

Now that statute reads as follows:

videotape, computer disk or any other material that contains an image of child pornography that has been mailed or shipped or transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce, or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means, including by computer, or that was produced using materials that have been mailed or shipped or transported in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means, including by computer, shall be punished as provided by law.

Any person who knowingly possesses any film,

Now, for you to find the defendant guilty of the offense charged in Count Seven, the Government must establish beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following essential elements:

That at or about -- within the Western District of North Carolina, at or about the time alleged, the defendant knowingly possessed any film, videotape, computer disk, or other material; and

Second, that the film, videotape, computer disk, or other material contained at least one image of child pornography; and

Third, the defendant knew that one or more persons depicted in the film, videotape, computer disk, or other material, was a minor; and

The film, videotape, computer disk, or other

material had been mailed or shipped or transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means, including by computer, or that was produced using materials that had been mailed or shipped or transported in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means, including by computer, those are the first four of these elements.

Additionally, should you conclude that the Government established each of the above elements, you shall then consider whether the Government established through proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the minor depicted in the child pornography had not attained 12 years of age; and

Secondly, that defendant knew the minor depicted in the child pornography had not attained 12 years of age.

There will be a place on the verdict sheet for you to address that secondary question should you reach that issue.

Now then, you are to use the same definition I gave you earlier to define "minor, visual depiction, sexually explicitly conduct, interstate or foreign commerce, computer, child pornography, and knowingly."

I'll now give you one additional definition pertinent to the offense of Possession of Child Pornography, which you should consider regarding Count Seven.

The word "possess" as in reference to possessing

materials -- the word "possess" means to own or exert control over. The word "possession" can take on several different but related means.

The law recognizes two kinds of possession; actual and constructive. A person who knowingly has direct physical control over a thing at a given time is then in actual possession of it. A person who, although not in actual possession, knowingly has both the power and the intention at a given time to exercise dominion or control over a thing, either directly or through another person or persons, is then in constructive possession of it.

The law recognizes that "possession" may be sole or joint. If one person alone has actual or constructive possession of a thing, then possession is sole. If two or more persons share actual or constructive possession of a thing, then possession is joint.

You may find that the element of "possession," as that term is used in these instructions, is present if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant had actual or constructive possession, either alone or jointly with others.

So in wrapping up Count Seven the following essential elements I shall reiterate for you.

If you find beyond a reasonable doubt from the evidence that on or about the date alleged, within the Western

District of North Carolina, and elsewhere:

The defendant knowingly possessed any film, videotape, computer disk, or other material; and

The film, videotape, computer disk, or other material contained at least one image of child pornography; and

Third, the defendant knew that one or more persons depicted in the film, videotape, computer disk, or other material was a minor; and

The film, videotape, computer disk, or other material had been mailed or shipped or transported using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means including by computer, or that was produced using materials that have been mailed, shipped, or transported in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means including by computer, then it would be your duty to return a verdict of guilty as charged in Count Seven. However, if you do not so find or if you have a reasonable doubt as to one or more of the essential elements of the crime charged, then it would be your duty to give the defendant the benefit of that doubt and return a verdict of not guilty on Count Seven.

If you return a verdict of guilty as to Count Seven as I have now described it, then you must consider the following question whether:

1. The minor depicted in the child pornography had not obtained 12 years of age; and

Secondly, whether defendant knew the minor depicted in the child pornography had not attained 12 years of age.

Now then, you've heard the evidence and the arguments of counsel for both parties. It is your duty to remember the evidence whether it has been called to your attention or not, and if your recollection of the evidence should differ from that of the attorneys, you are to rely solely upon your recollection of the evidence in your deliberations.

I have not reviewed the contentions of the parties, but it is your duty not only to consider all the evidence, but also the arguments, the contentions and positions urged by the attorneys in their speeches to you and any other contention that arises from the evidence, and to weigh them all in the light of your common sense, and as best you can determine the truth of this matter.

The law, as indeed it should, requires the presiding judge to be impartial. Therefore, do not assume from anything that I may have said or done during the trial that I have any opinion concerning any of the issues before you in this case.

I instruct you that a verdict is not a verdict until all 12 jurors agree unanimously as to what your decision shall be. You may not render a verdict by majority vote or any

other voting mechanism aside from unanimous verdict of 12.

And that pertains to all of the various decisions to be made as suggested to you by the verdict sheet and the various blanks that you will be asked to fill out in that regard.

The Court suggests that as soon as you reach the jury room, before beginning deliberations, you select one of your members to serve as foreperson. This individual has the same vote as the rest of the jurors, but simply serves to preside over the discussions. Once you begin deliberating, if you need to communicate with me, the foreperson would send a written message to me by knocking on the door and handing it to the Marshal. However, you are not to tell me how you may stand numerically as to your verdict at any given time. For instance, should you be split in your voting at a particular time, you would not tell me the specific numbers of division in your note.

We use a verdict sheet. And this is simply the written notice of the decision that you reach in the case. As soon as you've reached a verdict your foreperson will, as you go along, fill it out as to all the unanimous decisions and you would then return to the courtroom and your foreperson will, on request, hand the verdict sheet to the clerk. There are places on the verdict sheet for the foreperson to enter the verdict, sign it and date it.

Now during the trial several items were received

into evidence as exhibits. You will have access to most of the trial exhibits through what we call the J-E-R-S program that will be explained to you by the Clerk.

During your deliberations, you must not communicate with or provide any information to anyone by any means about this case. You may not use any electronic device or media, such as a cell phone, smart phone, like Blackberries or iPhones, or computers of any kind; the internet, any internet service, or any text, or instant messaging service like Twitter, or any internet chat room, blog, website or social networking service, such as Facebook, My Space, LinkedIn or You Tube to communicate to anyone, any information about this case or to conduct any research about this case until I finally accept your verdict.

Now, if you need a break during your deliberations, you may do so in the jury room, or if it's a smoke break, then outside the jury room escorted by a marshal. But you must not deliberate during a break unless all twelve of you are together at the time. And if not together, then do not talk about the case until all of you are back together.

Now, does either side request a sidebar concerning these instructions at this time?

MS. RANDALL: No, Your Honor.

MR. ADOLF: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

1 So the way that we'll handle the lunch hour, members 2 of the jury, I would, as I said earlier, I would dismiss you 3 for lunch. And it is now a little after 1:00. Let's say if 4 you would endeavor to be back somewhere around quarter of 2:00 5 then that gives you about 45 minutes. But you can have an 6 hour, whatever it takes for you to have lunch. But the way it 7 works is that when you come back to the courthouse, you come 8 to this jury room and go on in there and the marshal will be 9 checking people in. As soon as the 12 of you are ready, the 10 first 12 here are present, then you may start deliberating. And I will speak to you four alternates here in just a moment. 11 Our law clerk, Mr. Miller, has advised that I didn't 12 13 read to you Count Three of the indictment. 14 Would the parties request that Count Three be read from the indictment? 15 16 MS. RANDALL: Your Honor, the indictment will be 17 sent back with the jurors for their review; is that correct? 18 THE COURT: I beg your pardon? 19 MS. RANDALL: A copy of the indictment will be sent 20 back for them to review. 21 THE COURT: They will have a copy of the indictment. 22 And this is the Advertising allegation, the substantive count. 23 I think I'll read it to you, members of the jury, 24 won't take but a second. I'm sure you'll feel familiar with 25 it, but for clarity we'll read it.

It alleges that between, on or about August 19, 2014, and March 4, 2015, in Caldwell County, within the Western District of North Carolina and elsewhere, Steven W. Chase, Michael Fluckiger, David Lynn Browning:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Did knowingly make, print, and publish, and cause to be made, printed, and published, any notice or advertisement seeking and offering to receive, exchange, buy, produce, display, distribute, and reproduce any visual depiction, the production of which visual depiction involved the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct, and such visual depiction was of such conduct; and participation in any act of sexually explicit conduct by and with any minor for the purpose of producing a visual depiction of such conduct; knowing and having reason to know that such a notice and advertisement would be transported using any means or facility of interstate and foreign commerce, and in and affecting interstate and foreign commerce by any means, including by computer, and such notice and advertisement was transported using any means and facility of interstate and foreign commerce, and in and affecting interstate and foreign commerce by any means including by computer, alleged to be in violation of Section 2251.

So thank you, members of the jury.

Now then, I'll dismiss you for lunch. While you are at lunch, don't discuss the case. Keep an open mind about it.

Don't use any electronic media as I just described and you'll begin deliberating as soon as 12 of you check back in. Thank you.

(The jury was escorted from the courtroom at 1:09.)

THE COURT: Now, the regular jurors have left. I

want to thank you very much for your participation in this

case. As it happens, it will be the better part of wisdom if

you would stay with us until the jury reaches a verdict. The

reason for that is that sometimes one of these jurors would

have a sick child call from home or something and/or a parent

or somebody who's ailing or any number of things that would

cause a juror to be called away and have to go attend to

something. And in which case without having 12 jurors we

would have to start all over again, do the whole trial over.

Of course it's very expensive to do that, and so forth. So by

having the alternates we are blessed to have you with us and

willing and able to serve.

What I would ask you to do is go ahead and go to lunch. When you come back, Ms. Johnson will show you where to go, in fact, she may do it now, so you'll be comfortable until the jury reaches a verdict. If the jury comes in and wants a question to be asked. We will bring you all back for purposes of hearing just what they hear in response to any question. I don't anticipate that would be necessary or that it would happen.

1 But in any event, I would ask you to keep an open 2 mind about the case, don't discuss it with one another or 3 anyone else, and to follow all the instructions I've given the 4 jury up until now. And then should it happen that one or more 5 individuals within the jury can't continue, we would replace 6 such a juror or jurors with you in sequential order there, and 7 that will enable us to ensure we'll get a verdict on this case 8 and it won't have to be retried. Thank you so much for your 9 help in that regard. 10 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Judge, should they leave their notebooks here, the alternates? 11 12

THE COURT: That will be fine.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(The alternate jurors were excused.)

THE COURT: Will it be the pleasure of the parties to put in the record the written ruling on the 401 and Rule 403 rulings?

MR. ADOLF: Yes, sir. That would be our request.

THE COURT: All right. That will be a Court exhibit I take it.

MS. RANDALL: Your Honor, two other just quick housekeeping matters since it sounds like the jury is going to be deliberating as soon as they come back. The indictment that's going to be sent back to them, I assume will redact all charges after Count Seven through the signature?

THE COURT: That's correct, and the forfeiture

language.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then the charges relating to the MS. RANDALL: other defendants. And then one other matter, I want to make it clear on the record. When we submitted our documents for the JERS system to be submitted to the -- for the jurors. removed Government's Exhibit 5 and 14 from that. exhibits that were entered as kind of the mass bulk entering when the agent was testifying about all the screen shots he We went ahead and entered them since he was here to lay a foundation in case we wanted to use them later. He didn't actually offer any testimony or explain what the screen shots were about. The screen shots regarding some particular chats where people were talking about actually molesting children. So since they were not talked about, they were not explained and there was no testimony about them and they were never actually shown to the jury, we did not include those in the exhibits that were to be submitted into JERS. So I just wanted to let the Court and Mr. Adolf know that since the JERS system will not match the actual exhibit list.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

The special allegation as to defendant Michael Fluckiger was also taken out or redacted.

MS. RANDALL: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Now we will be -- assuming the jury comes back with a verdict of guilty for the purposes of this

```
announcement, I hope you all will look at the forfeiture
 1
 2
     instructions and be ready if it becomes pertinent to undertake
 3
     the, hopefully, brief hearing on forfeiture.
 4
               MR. BAIN-CREED: We will, Your Honor. We anticipate
 5
     a very brief argument there.
 6
               MR. ADOLF: Your Honor, there was one remaining
 7
     matter which was my motion, if indeed there is a conviction
     and I guess it would be after the forfeiture, to poll the jury
 8
 9
     on their views of punishment. I submitted it as a one
10
     question -- as a one question sheet that would say, "What do
     you -- How much time do you believe the defendant should be
11
12
     sentenced to in months?"
13
               THE COURT: Yeah. I'm going to deny that request.
14
               MR. ADOLF: I understand, Your Honor.
               (Lunch recess.)
15
16
               (The jury begins deliberations at 2:04.)
17
               (The jury knocks with a question.)
18
               (Question No. 1 was answered on paper to the jury.)
19
               (The jury knocks at 3:31:)
20
               (The defendant is present.)
21
               (The jury was returned to the courtroom.)
22
               THE COURT: All right. The Court received a note
23
     from the jury as follows:
24
               "Judge, Count Four refers to February 1, 2015.
                                                                And
25
     we need the specific exhibit associated with Count Four.
```

Please provide the exhibit." 1 2 And that is your request and that is not on the 3 system available in the jury room so we brought you out for 4 the purpose of showing that exhibit. 5 Would the Government state the number of that exhibit? 6 7 MS. RANDALL: Yes, Your Honor. This is Government's Exhibit 24. 8 THE COURT: All right. The alternates are present. 9 10 Yes, ma'am. I was going to ask, do you want me to 11 MS. RANDALL: 12 zoom in and scroll through the exhibit or how would you like 13 me to display it? 14 JUROR NO. 9: (Indicating.) 15 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 16 JUROR NO. 9: We just need to see the top lines on 17 the exhibit, sir. 18 THE COURT: All right. 19 JUROR NO. 9: Next to the avatar. 20 THE COURT: Show the top part then. 21 MS. RANDALL: If I could clarify, of the -- there 22 are two different avatars. I'll show the first one and then 23 the second one. 24 JUROR NO. 9: Okay. 25 THE COURT: Would you like to have it blown up any?

1	JUROR NO. 9: I think everybody is good, sir.
2	THE COURT: All right. Very well. If that
3	satisfies the question, then you may return to the jury room.
4	JUROR NO. 9: Thank you.
5	THE COURT: Thank you, all.
6	We'll be in recess. And thank you all for
7	continuing to be with us.
8	(The jury is excused and continues deliberations
9	from 3:36 until 4:00.)
10	THE COURT: Did the jury announce they have a
11	verdict?
12	THE DEPUTY CLERK: They did, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Are the parties ready to announce the
14	verdict?
15	MS. RANDALL: Yes, sir.
16	MR. ADOLF: Yes, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: May we have the jury and the alternates,
18	also.
19	(The jury was returned to the courtroom.)
20	THE COURT: All right, sir.
21	The jury is now seated in the jury box along with
22	the alternates.
23	Did the jury reach a verdict?
24	THE JURY: Yes, sir.
25	THE COURT: Was it unanimous as to all the various

decisions that have been entered on the verdict sheet? 1 2 THE JURY: Yes, sir. 3 THE COURT: And did you sign it and date it? 4 THE JURY: Yes, sir. 5 THE COURT: All right. Madam Clerk, if you will 6 receive the verdict sheet, please. 7 (Juror No. 9 handing verdict sheet to the Deputy Clerk.) 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. There's a couple of things we'll need to address. First of all, the verdict sheet has an 10 11 instruction on page 2 which says: 12 "If you found that the offense of advertising child 13 pornography was a predicate offense, skip Count Two and 14 continue to Count Three." 15 So I'm going to ask that the jury go back to the 16 jury room and see if you can't amend your verdict sheet so 17 that that is complied with. 18 JUROR NO. 9: Yes, sir. 19 THE COURT: All right. Madam Clerk. 20 Anything for the Court concerning the supplementary 21 instruction that has been given to the jury? 22 MR. BAIN-CREED: No objection, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: I take it the Government would want to 24 proffer some argument? 25 MR. BAIN-CREED: Yes, Your Honor, very brief.

mean, probably ten minutes or less. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 MR. BAIN-CREED: I'm not sure what the defense 4 anticipates proffering. 5 THE COURT: All right. You have no additional evidence? 6 7 MR. BAIN-CREED: No, sir. THE COURT: What about from the defendant? 8 9 MR. ADOLF: No additional evidence, Your Honor, just 10 very brief argument. 11 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Just for consistency sake, we'll let the Government 12 13 have a brief opportunity to respond to defense argument. 14 MR. BAIN-CREED: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 (The jury knocks at 4:08 and was returned to the 16 courtroom.) 17 THE COURT: Okay. Did the jury respond to the 18 Court's request? 19 JUROR NO. 9: Yes, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Did the additional adjustment you made 21 to the verdict sheet come with the unanimity of all the 22 jurors? 23 JUROR NO. 9: Yes, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Madam Clerk. 25 All right. And you have initialed the change on

page 2?

JUROR NO. 9: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And that is the verdict of the jury, so say you all.

THE JURY: (Nodding head affirmatively.)

THE COURT: I see affirmative nods there. Thank you.

Now then, members of the jury, you have one other item to take care of, not to be jocular about it, but it isn't 5:00 yet. The horn hasn't sounded. We have one short item for your attention. You have labored long and hard, but at this stage of the proceedings this additional responsibility becomes necessary in view of the verdict.

The defendant has been found guilty of the Counts

One through Seven, except for Two. I must now ask you certain questions concerning property the Government alleges is subject to forfeiture.

I have some short instructions, the parties will have an opportunity to say very short words about it, then you will be asked to deliberate on this matter as well. And there's, likewise, a short verdict sheet for the forfeiture aspect of the case.

In this regard, I instruct you that your previous verdict that defendant is guilty on those counts is binding on this part of the proceeding and you must not seek to discuss

or determine anew whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty of those charges. You've already made your findings there.

I further instruct you that what happens to any property that is declared forfeited is absolutely a matter for the Court to decide, that is, what happens to the property. You should not consider what might happen to the property in determining whether the property is subject to forfeiture.

In this connection you should disregard any claims that any other persons may have to the property. The interests that other persons may have in the property will be taken into account by the Court at a later time.

Similarly, any claims that the forfeiture of the property would constitute excessive punishment would be taken into account by the Court at a later time.

What you must now decide is whether the defendant must forfeit certain property that the Government claims is subject to forfeiture to the United States because of its connection to the offenses in Counts One and Two through Seven.

The first, the real property at, excuse me, 3570 15th Avenue SW, Naples, Florida; next, one ASUS Laptop, serial number ELN0CV0907390L2 and identified as Government's Exhibit Number 66; and lastly, one Cruzer 128 thumb drive and identified as Government's Exhibit Number 68.

Forfeiture means that, as part of the penalty for engaging in certain criminal activity, Defendant loses any ownership or interest he has or claims to have in certain property. Under federal law, any person who is convicted of violating Title 18 U.S. Code Section 2251 or Section 2252A shall forfeit to the United States any real property and personal property used or intended to be used to commit or to promote the commission of that person's Section 2251 or 2252A offenses.

In order to determine whether forfeiture is merited under this law, you will be asked to return a Special Verdict of Forfeiture on whether there is a nexus between the Section 2251 and Section 2252A offenses, and the defendant's residence in Naples, Florida, and the computer items identified in these instructions and on the special verdict sheet that I will provide to you.

"Nexus" means that there is a substantial connection between the properties and the crime. A substantial connection may be established by showing that the use of the property made the crime less difficult or more or less free from instruction or hinderance, or otherwise promoted the defendant's ability to complete the offense.

To be forfeitable the property need not be used exclusively for illegal activity. Property that is used the vast majority of the time for legitimate purposes may

nevertheless be forfeited if it promotes the commission of a criminal offense.

2.

You must consider what verdict to render on whether there is a nexus between the defendant's residence, the computer items, and the offenses of conviction of which you have already found defendant guilty.

All of my previous instructions regarding direct and circumstantial evidence, credibility of witnesses, and duty to deliberate apply with respect to your verdict regarding forfeiture.

However, in deliberating and deciding your verdict regarding forfeiture, I instruct you that the Government need only prove by a preponderance of the evidence whether there is a connection or nexus between the offense and the specific properties identified.

When I say the "offense" I refer, of course, to all the ones -- counts of conviction. The Government is not required to prove a nexus beyond a reasonable doubt. I instruct you that, in order for the Government to establish by a preponderance of the evidence the nexus of specific properties to the offenses, the Government must prove that it is more likely than not that the specific properties were used or intended to be used to commit or to promote the commission of a Section 2251 or Section 2252A offenses. In other words, "preponderance of the evidence" means that the Government's

evidence, when considered and compared with that opposed to it, has more convincing force and produces in your minds a belief that there is a nexus between the specifically identified properties and Defendant's crimes. Your job is to determine whether the nexus is more likely so than not.

While deliberating, you may consider any evidence, including but not limited to testimony, offered by the parties at any time during this trial. That includes, of course, witnesses -- witness testimony and exhibits. There won't be any new evidence at this time. You would just use the evidence you've already heard.

You must reach a unanimous verdict as to the questions on the Special Verdict Form. Everyone must agree to any "Yes" or "No" answer. Everyone must agree on whether the preponderance of the evidence proves that the property identified on the verdict form was used or intended to be used to commit or to promote the commission of the Counts One and Three through Seven offenses in violation of Title 18, Section 2251 and 2252A.

As I said, a Special Verdict form has been prepared for you. The Special Verdict form lists those three properties that I read out which the Government asserts are subject to forfeiture.

You may answer by simply putting an "X" or check mark in the space provided next to the words "Yes" or "No" on

each question.

Now then, would the Government have any words of argument in respect to this aspect of the trial?

MR. BAIN-CREED: Yes, sir, Your Honor. May it please the Court.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BAIN-CREED: Members of the jury, I'm a little late coming to the trial, but I work with Ms. Randall. My name is Benjamin Bain-Creed. I'm a forfeiture attorney. I handle this phase of the trial.

Now that you have returned guilty verdicts, effectually, as the Judge explained, what the Government is asking that you return a verdict that the 3570 15th Avenue SW, Naples, Florida, the ASUS Laptop be subject to forfeiture because they were used in the crimes. The way you fulfill your duty in this regard is, you determine whether there's a nexus between that property and the crime.

"Nexus" is a fancy legal word for connection. You apply a preponderance of the evidence, burden of proof being more likely than not. The burden of proof is a lesser burden than beyond a reasonable doubt. And you determine whether it's more likely than not that those properties were used in the crimes.

So I'm just going to ask you to look -- I'm going to make it very brief and ask you to look back to the same things

Ms. Randall asked you to look at in the closing argument. 2. Look at the fact the evidence shows the defendant accessed the email account he used to set up PlayPen from his Florida residence, from the privacy of that residence. Look at the evidence that he accessed PayPal, used PayPal to operate That was also from the privacy of his residence. Playpen. Look at the evidence that he accessed the PlayPen server on multiple occasions prior to the search, from the privacy of his Florida residence.

And look at the search itself. When law enforcement showed up his -- he was in the privacy of his residence. His computer was on. He was on the PlayPen server. He was logged in as the administrator. The thumb drive was in the computer with backup copies for purposes of using PlayPen, all in the privacy of his residence. Important to his crime is his residence which was used in the crimes, as well as the computer items.

In fact, the privacy is so important that he tried to prevent the police from coming in, which is not something he could do at Starbucks or the public library. This was private, just like Tor provided anonymity, the residence provided anonymity.

We would ask you to return a verdict of forfeiture on that residence, on the thumb drive, and on the computer. Thank you very much.

1 THE COURT: Mr. Adolf.

MR. ADOLF: Thank you, Your Honor.

Folks, you've convicted Mr. Chase of very serious crimes. You're aware of that. I respect that decision. I know you do some hard work back there. Now the government is trying to take his house on top of that. I'm not worried about the computers. The house that you heard that he lived in with his wife until her death, where they raised children. That's because they say he used the house to commit the crime because that's where he was sitting on the computer.

So I guess if you believe that, then I guess the government could take the glasses that he wore while he was sitting there on the computer. They could take the clothes off his back, because they kept him warm while he sat there on the computer. They could take his shoes, the clothes, the food in the refrigerator that he was snacking on so he could sit at the computer.

Is there any end to it? What does it even mean to use something?

If your teenage daughter is caught smoking marijuana in her bedroom, did she use your house to commit a drug crime? Be very, very careful about the power that you give your government, folks. It is not necessary to take his house away, and it's not the law. So I'm asking you not to do it. Thank you.

MR. BAIN-CREED: Just very briefly, members of the jury, as the Judge has instructed you, it's the Judge's role to determine whether a penalty is excessive.

Forfeiture is, in fact, a penalty in this case. It's a penalty for a heinous crime involving thousands of child pornography images that were made available to over 100,000 people worldwide. So, yes, it is a penalty.

But excessiveness arguments are for the Judge. Your only role is to determine if there is a connection between the house and the crimes. The government contends that connection is clear. This is something the defendant did from the privacy of his residence. He tried to keep law enforcement out when they came in. That is not something they could do other than in the privacy of his residence. We ask you to do that. So we ask you to return a verdict of forfeiture. Thank you.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, you heard the arguments and the Court's instructions. The clerk will hand you the verdict sheet. And I would appreciate it if you would step into the jury room and take care of this last aspect of the case.

(The jury was escorted from the courtroom at 4:21.)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: The Judge said to let you all look at the verdict sheet.

THE COURT: We'll be polling the jury when they come

```
back as to both the offenses and the forfeiture.
 1
 2
               MR. ADOLF: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
               (The jury knocks at 4:58:)
 4
               THE COURT: Did the jury indicate they reached a
 5
    verdict?
 6
               THE COURT SECURITY OFFICER: They did, Your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: Are the parties ready to receive the
    verdict?
 8
 9
               MR. BAIN-CREED: Yes, Your Honor.
10
               MR. ADOLF: Yes, Your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: May we have the jury.
               (The jury was returned to the courtroom at 5:00.)
12
13
               THE COURT: All right. The jury is seated. Did the
14
     jury reach a verdict on the forfeiture issue?
15
               JUROR NO. 9: Yes, sir, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Did you fill in the verdict sheet
17
     accordingly?
18
               JUROR NO. 9: Yes, sir.
               THE COURT: Was it a unanimous decision?
19
               JUROR NO. 9: Yes, sir.
20
21
               THE COURT: All right. Madam Clerk, we'll receive
22
     the verdict sheet.
23
               Okay. Madam Clerk, if you would please announce or
24
    publish the verdict. And members of the jury, please listen
25
    up as the clerk does so because you'll be asked in just a
```

moment if that is and does remain your verdict. 1 2 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Members of the jury, you have 3 found as follows: As to Defendant, Steven W. Chase: 4 5 "We, the jury, return the following Verdict as to 6 the charges contained in the Second Superseding Bill of 7 Indictment against Defendant, Steven W. Chase: "Count One: 8 9 "As to Count One, we the jury, find the Defendant, 10 Steven W. Chase guilty of engaging in a Child Exploitation Enterprise between or about August 19, 2014 and March 4, 2015, 11 as alleged in Count One of the Second Superseding Bill of 12 13 Indictment. 14 "Special Interrogatory 1: "Predicate Offenses Supporting Guilty Verdict on 15 16 Count One: " 17 As marked, "Advertising Child Pornography between on or about August 19, 2014 and March 4, 2015. 18 19 "Transporting or Shipping Child Pornography on or about February 1, 2015. 20 21 "Transporting or Shipping Child Pornography on or about October 12, 2014. 22 23 "Transporting or Shipping Child Pornography on or 24 about September 26, 2014. 25 "Possession of Child Pornography between on or about

August 19, 2014 and February 17th, 2015.

"If you found that the offense of Advertising Child Pornography was a predicate offense, skip Count Two and continue to Count Three.

"Count Two: No verdict.

"Count Three.

"As to Count Three, we the jury find the Defendant, Steven W. Chase, guilty of Advertising Child Pornography between on or about April 14, 2014 and March 4, 2015, as alleged in Count Three of the Second Superseding Bill of Indictment.

"Count Four.

"As to Count Four, we the jury find the Defendant, Steven W. Chase, guilty of Transporting or Shipping Child Pornography on or about February 1, 2015, as alleged in Count Four of this Second Superseding Bill of Indictment.

"Count Five.

"As to Count Five, we the jury find the Defendant, Steven W. Chase, guilty of Transporting or Shipping Child Pornography on or about October 12, 2014, as alleged in Count Five of the Second Superseding Bill of Indictment.

"Count Six.

"As to Count Six, we the jury find the Defendant, Steven W. Chase guilty of Transporting or Shipping Child Pornography, on or about September 26, 2014, as alleged in

Count Six of the Second Superseding Bill of Indictment. 1 2 "Count Seven. 3 "As to Count Seven, we the jury find the Defendant, 4 Steven W. Chase quilty of Possession of Child Pornography, 5 between on or about August 19, 2014 and February 17th, 2015, 6 as alleged in Count Seven of the Second Superseding Bill of 7 Indictment. "As to Question 1: 8 9 "Age of Minor in Child Pornography: 10 "Concerning the Child Pornography possessed by 11 Defendant relevant to Count Seven, did Defendant know that the 12 child pornography involved a minor who had not attained the 13 age of 12 years of age? 14 "Yes. "Special Verdict Form Forfeiture. 15 16 "We, the jury, unanimously find by a preponderance of evidence as follows: 17 18 "Count One Forfeiture: 19 "Was the real property at 3570 15th Avenue SW, 20 Naples, Florida, used or intended to be used to commit or to 21 promote the commission of the Count One offense in violation 22 of 18 U.S.C. Section 2252A(g)? 23 "Yes. 24 "2: Was the ASUS Laptop, serial number 25 ELNOCV0907390L2, and identified as Government's Exhibit Number

66, used or intended to be used to commit or to promote the commission of the Count One offense in the violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 2252A(g)?

"Yes.

"3: Was the Cruzer 128GB thumb drive, and identified as Government's Exhibit Number 68, used or intended to be used to commit or promote the commission of the Count One offense in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 2252A(g)?

"Yes.

"Count Three Forfeiture:

"1. Was the real property at 3570 15th Avenue SW, Naples, Florida, used or intended to be used to commit or to promote the commission of the Count Three offense in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 2251(d)?

"Yes.

"2. Was the ASUS Laptop, serial number ELNOCV0907390L2, and identified as Government's Exhibit 66, used or intended to be used to commit or to promote the commission of the Count Three offense in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 2251(d)?

"Yes.

"Was the Cruzer 128GB thumb drive, and identified as Government's Exhibit 68, used or intended to be used to commit or to promote the commission of the Count Three offense in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 2251(d)?

1 "Yes." 2 THE COURT: Madam Clerk, poll the jury. 3 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 1, was this your 4 verdict; is it still your verdict? 5 JUROR NO. 1: Yes. 6 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 2, was this your 7 verdict; is it still your verdict? 8 JUROR NO. 2: Yes. 9 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 3, was this your 10 verdict; is it still your verdict? 11 JUROR NO. 3: Yes. 12 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 4, was this your 13 verdict; is it still your verdict? 14 JUROR NO. 4: Yes. 15 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 5, was this your 16 verdict; is it still your verdict? 17 JUROR NO. 5: Yes. 18 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 6, was this your 19 verdict; is it still your verdict? 20 JUROR NO. 6: Yes. 21 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 7, was this your 22 verdict; is it still your verdict? 23 JUROR NO. 7: Yes. 24 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 8, was this your 25 verdict; is it still your verdict?

1 JUROR NO. 8: Yes. 2 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 9, was this your 3 verdict; is it still your verdict? 4 JUROR NO. 9: Yes. 5 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 10, was this your 6 verdict; is it still your verdict? 7 JUROR NO. 10: Yes. 8 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 11, was this your 9 verdict; is it still your verdict? 10 JUROR NO. 11: Yes. 11 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 12, was this your 12 verdict; is it still your verdict? 13 JUROR NO. 12: Yes. 14 THE COURT: Thank you, Madam Clerk. 15 Will there be anything further for the jury before 16 they are released? 17 MS. RANDALL: Not from the government, Your Honor. 18 Thank you. 19 MR. ADOLF: No, Your Honor. 20 All right. Members of the jury, I want THE COURT: 21 to thank all of you and, also, of course, the alternates. 22 civil cases alternates deliberate alongside civil juries but 23 we're not able to do that in criminal cases. You necessarily 24 serve a very important position should you be needed to go in 25 to replace a juror with some issue and couldn't continue

deliberating. All of you deserves our thanks. We appreciate 1 2 your service to the Court. If you have any questions about 3 your service, call the Clerk on the third floor or the 4 telephone number you've been given. I asked you not to talk 5 about the case until it was over. Now it is over. If one of 6 the attorneys or anyone else asks you about the case or anyone 7 at home, you're entirely free to discuss it if you wish, but you're under no obligation to do so if you would rather not. 8 (The jury was escorted from the courtroom at 5:09.) 9 10 THE COURT: All. The jury has departed. Mr. Chase, the jury having found as it did --11 Excuse me. I forget my umbrella. 12 13 THE COURT: Okay. Feel free to come forward and 14 pick it up. 15 JUROR: It's on top.

THE COURT: You thought of it in a timely manner.

(The juror has exited the courtroom.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Chase, the jury finding as they did, the remaining matter will be the sentencing hearing. Between now and the time of the sentencing hearing you, and I would say the probation officer, will be preparing a presentence report. And you'll be asked to provide an interview for that report if you see fit, and your attorney may be with you at the time of such an interview if you wish.

THE DEFENDANT: (Nodding head affirmatively.)

1 THE COURT: Then at the time of sentencing you will 2 have had a copy of the presentence report for at least 35 3 days. That will give you and your attorney time to go over it 4 carefully and make sure it's accurate. And your attorney may 5 file objections to it if it is not, and those objections would 6 be resolved by the Court. At the time of sentencing you and 7 your attorney will both be having the opportunity to speak to the Court about the matter of an appropriate sentence, and 8 9 evidence may be offered at that time also if that is in order. 10 Do you have any question about these matters? 11 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor, I don't. 12 THE COURT: All right. 13 THE DEFENDANT: Everything is covered. 14 THE COURT: All right, sir. 15 Anything further before the Court adjourns for the 16 evening? 17 MR. BAIN-CREED: No, Your Honor. 18 MR. ADOLF: No, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: All right. 20 (The matter is concluded at 5:14.) 21 22 23 24 25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

I, Laura Andersen, Federal Official Court Reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, do hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the stenographically reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Dated this the 14th day of August, 2017.

S/Laura Andersen
Laura Andersen, RMR
Federal Official Court Reporter